John Carter Brown
Library
Brown University

Evans 20981

1457

A

CRITICAL EXAMINATION

OF THE

MARQUIS de CHATELLUX's

TRAVELS,

IN

NORTH AMERICA,

IN A

LETTER

ADDRESSED TO THE

MARQUIS;

PRINCIPALLY INTENDED AS A REFUTATION OF HIS OPINIONS CONCERNING THE

QUAKERS, THE NEGROES, THE PEOPLE,

AND

MANKIND.

TRANSLATED FROM THE FRENCH

OF

J. P. BRISSOT DE WARVILLE,

WITH

ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS

OF THE

AUTHOR.

Je ſuis toujours pour les perſecutés.

PHILADELPHIA:
PRINTED BY JOSEPH JAMES, IN CHESNUT-STREET.
M,DCC,LXXXVIII.

A

CRITICAL EXAMINATION

OF THE

MARQUIS DE CHATELLUX'S

TRAVELS

IN

NORTH-AMERICA.

SIR,

I TAKE the earlieſt opportunity of letting you know, how much I have ſuffered by the peruſal of your travels, and I think it neceſſary to make this declaration public. I have a very cogent reaſon for ſo doing. They, in many places, contain errors, and, I will venture to ſay, a poiſon, which, under your name, will have a rapid circulation; and to which we cannot be too haſty in applying an antidote.

A poiſon! You may ſtart at the expreſſion; but I can neither ſuppreſs or ſoften it, as it is ſo preciſely characteriſtic of your opinions reſpecting the Quakers, the Negroes, and the People.

In vilifying the Quakers, you may prevent the good effects of their pious example. In refuſing the name of men to the Negroes, you give your ſanction to the treating them like beaſts of burthen, if not to the ſpilling of their blood; and you hinder the effects of that philoſophical commotion, which will no doubt procure their general emancipation. In making the People contemptible, you invite their oppreſſors to rivet their chains. Theſe are matters of great

importance.——They will juſtify me to the public, for having taken up my pen in ſo precipitate a manner; they will juſtify me, even in your eyes, for having uſed it againſt yourſelf: your reaſon will undoubtedly plead for me, in oppoſition to your feelings, and you will pardon me for having publiſhed truths, perhaps diſagreeable ones for you, when I ſhall have convinced you, that they are of public utility, and not to be ſuppreſſed. *Amicus Plato ſed magis amica veritas.* This ſhould be the motto of every writer who has really the public good at heart.

I do not mean, in this place, to criticiſe your book throughout.—Let the journaliſts point out the *beauties* of your ſtile.—My buſineſs is to obviate the miſchievous tendency of your work, without paying any attention to the elegance of the language. I ſhould, indeed, have been better pleaſed, if you had not ſhewn ſo much uneaſineſs about getting a bad ſupper, or ſo much pleaſure from having made a good one; and could have diſpenſed with the exact detail you have given us of every diſh; for it is not the journal of an Apicius, but that of a philoſopher and ſtateſman which we expect to read, when we ſee the name of the author of *La Felicité Publique** in the title page.—I ſhould have been better pleaſed if your obſervations had not been confined to taverns, and if you had not ſacrificed our American friends to the pleaſure of making jeſts.——Alas! what will be the opinion of thoſe whom you have thus offended, when they read your book—and how can we expect a friendly reception from them, when they find their ſecrets betrayed, and the unreſerved effuſions of the heart ridiculed by a man decorated with ſo many titles? What confidence will they now place in an obſcure Frenchman? On his firſt approach, the American will exclaim—are you alſo come to ſpy out our follies, and publiſh them to Europe?

* An excellent treatiſe, (allowing for a few errors,) attributed to the MARQUIS de CHATELLUX, and which I have commended in ſeveral of my writings.

It would have been ſatisfactory to have ſeen more penetration in your enquiries concerning the effects of the different political conſtitutions of America.—I could have wiſhed for ſome account of the number of criminals; of the crimes which are moſt frequent; of the difference of morals in the cities, in the country, and in the newly ſettled parts; of the ſtate of the finances, &c. and I ſhould alſo have been better pleaſed, if, inſtead of railing at democracies, you had ſummed up grievances and well atteſted facts.——But this is not a proper place for the diſcuſſion of theſe intereſting ſubjects.

The principal charges, I bring againſt you, may be reduced to three:

I. You have calumniated and ridiculed the reſpectable ſect of Quakers.

II. You have vilified the Negroes.

III. You have vilified Mankind and the People.

Theſe are the three general charges againſt you, which I now lay before the tribunal of the Public.—After having diſcuſſed them, I ſhall add ſome reflections on ſeveral other ſubjects you have treated of, which appear to me equally ſuſceptible of cenſure.

In making this examination, I ſhall, firſt of all, quote your opinions and aſſertions, and then endeavour to refute them.

I begin with the article concerning the Quakers.

VINDICATION *of the* QUAKERS.

'Inſtead of their company, we had that of Mr. 'Benezet, an old Quaker, whoſe ſhort ſtature, and 'low, *mean* figure, formed a *perfect* contraſt to Mr. 'Pendleton's. This Mr. Benezet may be looked on 'rather as a model of what the Quakers ought to 'be than as a ſpecimen of what they are.—As his 'only object was the good of others, his charity 'and generoſity made him greatly reſpected in thoſe 'more happy times, when a citizen derived all his 'honor from his virtues. Now the din of arms has 'drowned the ſighs of charity, and the love of our

'fellow creatures yields to patriotiſm. Yet Mr. Bene-
'zet ſtill continues in the practice of doing good. He
'came to get ſome information from me, on the means
'lately found out in France, of reſtoring drowned per-
'ſons to life. I promiſed, not only to ſend him an
'account of the methods uſed in thoſe caſes, when I
'returned to Newport, but alſo to procure him one
'of the boxes which our government has ordered to
'be placed at every ſea-port town. We ſoon got bet-
'ter acquainted; and, ſpeaking of the misfortunes of
'war, he ſaid to me,—My Friend, I know thou art a
'man of letters, and a member of the French academy.
'Several good things have lately been writen by men
'of letters; they have attacked errors and prejudices,
'and eſpecially intolerance: Will not they try to
'give men a diſtaſte for war, and make them live to-
'gether like friends and brethren? Thou art right,
'ſaid I, in expecting ſomething from the progreſs of
'philoſophical knowledge. Several active hands are
'now at work upon the great edifice of public good;
'but it will be to no purpoſe for them to finiſh any
'part of it, while the foundation is wanting, and
'this foundation is, as thou haſt ſaid, a general
'peace. As to intolerance and perſecution, it is true,
'that thoſe two enemies of mankind are not yet ſuf-
'ficiently chained down; but let me whiſper a word
'in thy ear, the full meaning of which thou wilt not
'perhaps comprehend, though thou art well ac-
'quainted with the French language. They are no
'longer *faſhionable;* and, I ſhould even think, they
'were nearly *out of date*, were it not for ſome little
'matters thou art unacquainted with: which is, that
'thoſe who attack them are ſometimes impriſoned,
'while their defenders are rewarded with livings of
'an hundred thouſand livres a year. An hundred
'thouſand livres a year! cries Benezet, why, with
'that they might build hoſpitals, and ſet up manu-
'factories; and, to be ſure, that's what they do with
'their money. No, my friend, ſaid I, perſecution
'muſt be paid for; and yet, I muſt ſay, the pay is

'but mean, and the higheſt price given by the richeſt 'perſecutor, is no more than one thouſand, or 'twelve hundred livres a year, to ſome ſatirical poets, 'or writers of journals, who are enemies to lite-'rature, and whoſe works are much read, tho' they 'have but a dull ſale. Friend, ſays the Quaker to 'me, this perſecution is a ſtrange thing; I can hard-'ly believe what has happened to myſelf. My fa-'ther was a Frenchman born, and ſo am I. It is 'now about ſixty years ſince he was obliged to ſeek 'an aſylum in England, carrying with him his chil-'dren, the only treaſures which he could ſave in his 'misfortunes. Juſtice, or what is called ſo in thy 'country, had him hung in effigy, becauſe he ex-'plained the Goſpel in a different way from your 'prieſts. The Engliſh clergy gave my father but lit-'tle more ſatisfaction, ſo that he wiſhed to get away 'from all hierarchy, and came to ſettle in this coun-'try, where I have lived very happily until the 'breaking out of the war. I have long ſince forgot-'ten all the perſecutions my family have undergone. 'I love thy nation, becauſe it is a mild and a feeling 'one; and for thee, my friend, I know thou doſt 'every thing in thy power to ſerve thy fellow 'creatures. When thou returneſt to Europe, get thy 'brethren to aſſiſt thee:—and let me now recom-'mend our friends in Rhode-Iſland to thy attention. 'He then named all the Quakers who live in that 'ſtate, and are pretty numerous; and recommended 'them to my care. At parting, he aſked leave to 'ſend me ſome pamphlets of his *own manufacturing*, 'written chiefly in defence of his ſect. I aſſured him, '*it would give me great pleaſure to read them;* and he 'did not fail to ſend them next morning.

'Of whatever ſect a man, glowing with zeal and 'love for his fellow creatures, may be, he is moſt 'undoubtedly a reſpectable being; but, I confeſs, I 'cannot beſtow on this ſect in general, the eſteem 'which ſome individuals of it are entitled to. The 'law, which many of them follow, of not ſaying

'*you*, nor *ſir*, *is far from giving them an air of plainneſs* '*or candor*. It is perhaps to make up for this clown-'iſhneſs, that they often ſpeak in a *whining*, *inſinuat-*'*ing* tone, which is perfectly *jeſuitical*. Their con-'duct too, is quite of a piece with their language. 'Concealing *their indifference for the public good*, un-'der the appearance of religion, they are ſparing 'of blood, it is true, and *eſpecially of their own*; they 'are mere ſharpers at *cheating* both parties out of 'their money, and that *without a bluſh*, or the leaſt 'regard to what may be thought of them. It is a 'received maxim in trade, that they are not to be 'truſted. This opinion is a juſt one, and time will 'more and more ſhew the propriety of it.

'Indeed, nothing can be more dangerous than en-'thuſiaſm in its decline; for hypocriſy is the only 'ſubſtitute that can be found for it. This monſter, 'ſo well known in Europe, gains but too much ground 'in every religious ſect.

'On Sunday, the 10th, I determined to *take a turn* '*thro' the churches, and ſtudy the different modes of wor-*'*ſhip*. Unfortunately for me, the ſeveral ſects, who 'agree in nothing elſe, have fixed on the ſame hour for 'aſſembling their congregations; ſo that I could only go 'to the Quaker's meeting-houſe in the morning, and to 'the church of England in the afternoon. The Qua-'ker's meeting is a ſquare room, in every part of which, 'and parallel to the four walls, are benches and 'deſks, ſo that they ſit oppoſite to one another; 'without altar or pulpit to fix their attention. When 'they are met, ſome one of their elders makes an *ex-*'*tempore* prayer, juſt what comes into his head; they 'are then ſilent, 'till ſome man or woman is inſpired, 'and gets up to ſpeak. Travellers muſt be believed 'on their words, let the account they give be ever 'ſo extraordinary. Like Arioſto, I ſhall relate pro-'digies—*dirò maraviglia*. It is nevertheleſs true, 'that a woman *held her tongue* juſt as I came in. A 'man took her place, and ſpoke *like a blockhead on in-*'*ternal grace, the illumination of the Spirit, and all the*

'*other tenets of his ſect*, which *he had over and over again*, 'without attempting to explain any thing. He at 'length got to the end of his ſermon, to the great 'joy of his brethren and ſiſters, who all appeared 'abſent and tired out. After ſeven or eight minutes 'ſilence, an old man got on his knees, and retailed 'us out a very *inſipid* prayer, after which they broke 'up the meeting.

'On leaving this *gloomy* and *clowniſh* meeting, the 'ſervice of the church of England, with the muſic 'and ornaments, ſeemed like an *opera*. An *handſome* 'pulpit, placed before a *fine* organ, a *well-dreſſed* 'miniſter in the pulpit, reading, ſpeaking, and ſing-'ing, *with a grace perfectly theatrical*; the young 'women, *from the pit and boxes*, joining him with 'their melodious voices; a ſoft and agreeable ſinging, 'interrupted by ſome excellent airs on the organ; 'all this, compared to the worſhip of the Quakers, Ana-'baptiſts, and Preſbyterians, ſeemed rather a little Para-'diſe, than the road to Paradiſe. However, by reflecting 'on ſo many different ſects, ſome of whom are rigid, and 'ſome trifling, but every one imperious and narrow, 'one is lead to believe, that all mankind read the 'great book of nature, as * *Montauciel read his own*; 'where, for "*vous etes un blanc bec*"—he always read, "*trompette bleſſée*." It is a thouſand to one that he 'gueſſes the meaning of a ſingle line, as he cannot 'even ſpell; but ſhould ſuch an one come to you for 'aſſiſtance, give him none. You had better leave 'him to enjoy his miſtake, than cut one another's 'throats.'

This is the moſt violent attack in your travels a-gainſt the Quakers. In other parts you have ſeveral things againſt them, but none worth mentioning.

Before entering into the particulars which the ex-

* Montauciel is the name of an ignorant ſoldier, one of the characters in the Deſerter, a comic opera. He engages the Deſerter to teach him to read. He gets a bit of paper in his hand, on which the words, *vous etes un blanc bec*, are written, and on ſpelling the letters, he makes out *trompette bleſſée*. The Deſerter ſhews him his miſtake, and the word *blanc bec* (ſimpleton) becomes the ſource of altercation.

amination of your ſatire requires, I ſhall make bold to aſk you, Sir, what facts, books, or men, have authoriſed you to condemn this ſect ſo haſtily? Have you known a great number, or the generality of Quakers? Have you lived a long time in habits of intimacy with them? Can you form a judgment of them all, and know the worth of the whole ſociety, from having been at one or two of their meetings? or from having converſed with one or two of them in a haſty manner? or from having been introduced to one who did not think fit to look at you? When you went into that religious meeting, where you formed a judgment of the diſcourſe, or prayer which you heard, were you in a proper ſtate of mind for the ſincere inveſtigation of truth? Had you no prejudices againſt the Quakers? and your theatrical knowledge too, which brought ridicule into your head, this ridicule which is ſo powerful an argument for a French Man; did not this ſame knowledge ſpread a veil over your mind—Have you not been prejudiced againſt the Quakers by Voltaire, who has by turns praiſed them, and endeavoured to make them appear ridiculous, though he knew but little of them? And indeed, who would not at firſt ſight, regard your teſtimony as ſuſpicious, and your judgment as partial, on conſidering your moral and religious opinions, your character of academician, ſoldier and man of quality, that three fold character, which this ſociety ſo juſtly deteſt.

And why have you, in forming a judgment of them, abandoned thoſe principles by which our judgment ſhould ever be directed—We have no right to cenſure any one, unleſs we have either ourſelves detected him violating the laws of honour and probity, or upon the authentic and impartial teſtimony of others on his crime. Vague reports ought never to have any weight.

To condemn a whole body of men at once, a ſociety of long ſtanding, to accuſe them of cheating, of ſelfiſhneſs, and hypocriſy, requires a ſeries of well

atteſted facts, the truth of which is of the greater conſequence, as the charges are ſerious, and involve ſo many people in them.

Thus, ſhould any one charge the Catholics with having been perſecutors, they might prove it by their Autos-da-fé, their inquiſition, Saint Bartholomew's day, the Iriſh maſſacre, &c. To prove that the Puritans of former times were perſecutors, we need only mention the tragical ſcenes which were acted during the revolution of 1650 in England, and the perſecutions they excited in the new world.—To prove the ambitious, intriguing and perſecuting ſpirit of the Jeſuits, we have only to refer to their unceaſing manœuvres in England and France, the deſtruction of Port-Royal, and the many lettres de cachet, which they have made uſe of to deſtroy, in ſecret priſons, a crowd of victims, whoſe only fault was a different way of thinking—Theſe are facts well atteſted.

But have you, Sir, any ſuch facts to allege againſt the Quakers? not a ſingle one—So far from that, you produce none but what are in their favour—For I ſhall now and then have the ſatisfaction of making uſe of your own words to refute you.

But it is becauſe you bring no poſitive charge of any crime againſt the Quakers; it is becauſe you judge them only by hear-ſay and vague reports, that I conclude you have no proof of the vices and crimes you reproach them with; and that your judgment of them is unjuſt.

I will not, however, confine myſelf to this general method of reaſoning, but will follow you ſtep by ſtep—I believe your reflections on the Quakers may be reduced to three principle heads; they affect

Either their moral and private conduct,
Their religious tenets,
Or their civil principles—

I ſhall now proceed to ſhew how unjuſtly you have treated them in theſe three different reſpects.

Of the MORAL *and* PRIVATE CONDUCT *of the* QUAKERS.

I have been acquainted with many Quakers in Lon-

don—I have endeavoured to become acquainted with their principles, and have looked on it as my duty to pay them the following public tribute of eſteem, in a work,* written at a time when I wiſhed to ſerve my countrymen, by giving them a faithful account of that Iſland, which deſerves our imitation, rather than our jealouſy; in a work, wherein, as a writer of a foreign journal has well obſerved, my deſign was to introduce good principles in an Engliſh dreſs. †

'Simplicity, candor and honeſty, characterized 'their words and actions; they were not full of pro-'feſſions, but ſincere; they were not poliſhed, but hu-'mane; they had no wit—none of that wit ſo eſſential 'in France, and which there ſupplies the place of eve-'ry thing elſe; but they poſſeſſed good ſenſe, ſound 'judgments, upright hearts and honeſt ſouls; in a 'word, if I were to ſeek for ſociety, it ſhould be a-'mongſt the Quakers; if I ſought for amuſement, I 'would have recourſe to my own countrymen—And 'their women too, I ſhall be aſked, what can be ſaid 'of them? They are juſt what women ſhould be eve-'ry where, faithful to their huſbands, affectionate to 'their children, careful and frugal in their domeſtic 'economy, plain in their dreſs, § and above all, they 'are neither ſolicitous to pleaſe any other individu-'al, nor to attract the public attention. As they 'make no outward ſhew, they pay a greater regard 'to the cultivation of their minds—This ſimplicity 'of manners is yet obſervable in ſome other coun-'tries; the Arabs, for example, even now, follow

* See Vol. 2nd. No. 4, Page 196, of the Journal du Licée de Londres, ou Tableau des Sciences & des Arts, a Work publiſhed in England in 1784, by the Author of this book.

† See No. 11, of the Correſpondence Literaire Secrette, for 1785, a foreign Publication, which is not ſpoilt by the Pen of the Cenſor Royal, and contains many intereſting anecdotes and ſtriking Articles, favourable to the cauſe of humanity.

§ I ſhould have added, well informed in the principles of morality and religion. I knew a young woman of this ſociety, who poſſeſſed a wonderful ſolidity of thought, and firmneſs of character; I have ſeen few countenances in which morality was ſo ſtrongly marked. It was owing in her, to an internal convincement; to that convincement, which is the effect of the moſt ſerious enquiry.

'the ſame wandering lives as the firſt Patriarchs. It 'cannot be too often repeated, that ſuch manners as 'theſe are productive of domeſtic economy, the hap-'pineſs of families, and public virtues—But *we* have 'renounced them, diſeaſed unhappy wretches as we 'are, with all our civilization and politeneſs—And yet 'what man amongſt us is happy, but he who has the 'courage to live as nature directs, as the good of 'paſt ages have lived, who are ſo politely ridiculed 'by the wits of the preſent day—Si ad naturam vives, 'ſays Seneca, nunquam eris pauper, ſi ad opinionem 'nunquam dives—If thy life is regulated by nature, 'ſays Seneca, thou wilt never be poor, if by the opi-'nions of others, thou wilt never be rich.'

I have not the preſumption to ſuppoſe that my ſingle teſtimony will be preferred to yours—But how many others * could I bring in ſupport of my own. I ſhall ſelect one, which is ſtriking and deciſive; it is that of the ſentimental author of the American farmer's letters—You as well as myſelf, are perſonally acquainted with him, and you know too, that his candor, goodneſs of heart, and diſpoſition, entitle him to our confidence; I am united to him by the tendereſt ties of friendſhip, and a great ſimilarity of ſentiment; but, I mean not to be ſwayed by friendſhip, while I am conſidering the weight

* See l' Hiſtorie de l' Eſtabliſſement des Europiens dans les Indes, at the article Pennſylvania.

See alſo the tranſlation of the Pennſylvania Farmer's letters to the inhabitants of North-America; an excellent work (of a different nature from St. John de Crevecœur's) which was publiſhed the beginning of the troubles in America by Mr. Dickinſon, who was a principal character in the revolution, and lately Preſident of the Council of Pennſylvania. We owe the tranſlation of this work to the celebrated Turgot, who had a high opinion of it: It was publiſhed at Paris in 1769, and although it contained many important political truths, yet no impreſſion was made by it.

See further on this ſubject, the following works.

A ſmall Pamphlet by Anthony Benezet, on the ſettlement of the Quakers in America. A Sermon preached by Dr. Prieſtly, on the abolition of the Slave trade.

Several of the articles in Voltaire's Queſtions on the Encyclopedia.

Some conſiderations on the Teſt-Law of Pennſylvania, by an Author of great merit, who is no Quaker.

which is due to his teſtimony. He lived for a long time in America, and lived with Quakers; he has been intimate with them, has attended to, and maturely conſidered their behaviour in civil life, and his opinion of them is wholly different from yours†—With what warmth does he praiſe the ſimple and cordial hoſpitality he met with in their houſes, and the peace and happineſs which reigned there—"*Every thing there is done in ſilence, and with cheerfulneſs*" How does he praiſe the good ſenſe, the ſagacity, the temperance, the ſoftneſs and the education of their women. 'They are generally, ſays he, ſhining 'without being ſhowy, ſolid without pedantry, the 'enemies of levity, trifles and affectation; from rea-'ding good books in their early youth, their conver-'ſation is more intereſting than is often met with, 'and they acquire a foundation of ſolid learning, 'which has often ſurpriſed me—They are remarka-'ble, not only for the ſimplicity of their dreſs, but 'alſo for the extreme neatneſs of their houſes, and of 'every thing about them—Silence and modeſty, a 'peculiar manner of ordering their ſervants and in-'feriors, an uniform, tranquil behaviour, ſeem to con-'ſtitute the general character of theſe good people.'

And who has not read his intereſting viſit to the botaniſt Bartram, the affecting anecdote of the emancipation of Warner Miffiin's Negro, and the account of his bold errand to general Howe? who has not eagerly ſeized on all thoſe recitals which paint ſo well the very ſoul of the Quakers, and lay open their principles to us? What reader ſo frozen-hearted as not to be moved, affected, tranſported into America, in raptures with the patriarchal life? What reader but will indulge himſelf in theſe delightful reveries, and wiſh to become, like them, good, ſimple, and the child of nature? What reader, in a word, but has felt himſelf inclined to reſpect them as the moſt moral, edifying and pious, of all religious ſects?

† See the American Farmer's Letters, Vol. 1ſt. from page 137, to 197, and the anecdote in the Preface.

And you, Sir, wiſh to deſtroy this enchantment—By your ſilence you contradict all I have ſaid. Cruel man! If it was an illuſion, how could you wiſh to undeceive us? It was dear to us, as it ſerved to increaſe the conſolation of the good, and the remorſe of the wicked—But no, it is no illuſion—they are truths, they are facts, which you are combating; you who have ſeen America only in her camps, amidſt the din of arms, and in one of thoſe violent revolutions, where man, thrown out of his ſphere, is no longer himſelf, and can neither form a right judgment of things, nor is he a proper ſubject for the judgment of others; you who have obtained your knowledge of America only by flying through it, by ſtopping at taverns, and perhaps now and then going to a ball, or tea-party; you, to contradict a native of America, a farmer who gives his opinion, after twenty-five years of obſervations, made at his leiſure in the midſt of peace, confidence and friendſhip!

And what are the weapons you make uſe of? European and national prejudices. You have no facts on your ſide, and this reſpectable man has many; they are well authenticated, and the names he mentions well known. He quotes a Benezet, a Mifflin, a Bartram, and you, with all your talking of hypocrites and cheats, you name nobody. How then can we give credit to your aſſertions?

In my opinion you deſerve a very ſevere reproof for ſuch conduct—When one author attacks the ſentiments of another, he ſhould quote him, name him, and appeal to the public deciſion: Nothing but the deſpicable character of our opponent can excuſe ſuch an omiſſion—Now, you have publiſhed opinions and aſſertions, directly in contradiction to thoſe of St. John de Crevecœur, and you have not ſaid a ſingle ſyllable of him, nor of his book; a book too which has engaged the public attention, and yet you have read it.—You well know how much the author is eſteemed in America, and you yourſelf have expreſſed your perſonal eſteem for him. Since you attack, not merely

his opinions, but his narrations and his facts; common politeneſs, attention and reſpect for the public, did then, and ſtill do, require, that you give your reaſons for not mentioning him, and for differing from him in ſentiment.

Who then ſhall we give credit to, concerning the Quakers? to St. John de Crevecœur, or to the Marquis de Chatellux? one praiſes, the other traduces them: theſe are queſtions I have often heard, and which you ought to have prevented; but by not mentioning this author's name, nor his book, you have thrown the public into a ſtate of uncertainty on theſe points.

I know very well, that this treacherous, jeſuitical ſilence, which Academicians and men of the world are ſo well acquainted with, is honored with the name of conſideration and reſpect. The means of ruining a public character, by general remarks, or by not ſaying any thing at all of him, is a ſecret many are well acquainted with; but believe me, this cowardly practice of our literary ariſtocracy, in no-wiſe becomes you. The motto of every honeſt writer ſhould be, *When I attack any one, I do it from motives of duty, and do it openly.*

The public cannot long remain in the ſtate of uncertainty you have thrown them into, if they will but attend to the arguments I have already brought to controvert your opinions, and to thoſe I ſhall hereafter produce. The difference in your manner of writing is againſt you. If I were even unacquainted with St. John de Crevecœur, if I had not been on the moſt intimate footing with him, I could give my judgment after having read over both your books; his is a work of the heart, your's ſhews that you have a great deal of wit; but republicans, pure moraliſts, ſuch as the Quakers, muſt be judged by the heart; their reputation will receive no ſhock from all the art you have made uſe of to injure them.

I ſhall now begin to follow you ſtep by ſtep.

The law which you ſay, *many* of them obſerve, of ſaying neither *You*, nor *Sir*, is far from giving them

an *air* of ſimplicity and candor. This is not the cuſtom of *many*, but of *all* the ſociety.

You ſpeak of an *air*, as if the Quakers aſſumed any *airs*; as if their plainneſs was but affectation. They are much above it; the plainneſs of their language conſiſts in renouncing thoſe empty forms, thoſe ridiculous compliments and faſhionable falſhoods which French politeneſs requires; it is on this plainneſs the Quakers value themſelves; they do not tell a ſtranger that they are charmed to ſee him; they keep ſilence at the firſt interview, and wait for an opportunity of forming a judgment; they do not ſqueeze the hand of a man whom they deſpiſe; they do not bow to a fine ſuit of clothes, a croſs, or a red or blue ribband; they do not pay court to a miniſter, who is deteſted by the nation—If they *thee* and *thou* every body, it is becauſe they believe all men are equal; are not theſe ſufficient reaſons for a Philoſopher?

The undaunted manner in which they have ſupported this cuſtom at court, and at the bar; that boldneſs which has conſtrained thoſe in authority to give way to them, will not even this entitle them to your praiſe? For admitting with you, that it is a matter of indifference to ſay *you* or *thou* to a ſingle perſon, yet it muſt be of importance, to have a character, and to poſſeſs a degree of firmneſs, of that unſhaken firmneſs, which is ſo hateful to oppreſſors, becauſe they dread the conſequences of it; and, it matters not, that this firmneſs appears in ſmall things, and trifling circumſtances; for there is no doubt, but it will be called forth with greater energy, on more important occaſions. Now, the perſecutions which the Quakers have undergone, for not giving up their *Thee* and *Thou*, ſhew a greatneſs of character, and of conſequence a ſuperiority over the reſt of mankind, which they have ever ſuſtained, when their civil or religious principles have been attacked by government. But after all, as to this cuſtom of theirs, which you find ſo much fault with, let us ſee whether they or the men of the world are in the right: ſince *You* takes in ſeveral perſons, why make uſe of it to one

only? adulation firſt invented this corrupt practice, and pride and baſeneſs of ſoul have brought it into general uſe: The Quakers wiſh to reſtore the cuſtoms of propriety, and what objections can you make to them? muſt they limp becauſe you are not ſtrong enough to walk upright?

If our ſelf-conceited literati, and would-be philoſophers, had really any philoſophy about them, would not they imitate the Quakers? Would they not renounce thoſe mean ceremonies, which ſhow the ſlaviſhneſs and falſhood of mankind? Would they not inſtead of ridiculing the Quakers, endeavour, like them to exalt human nature, and compel the great to believe that the loweſt of their fellow creatures is their equal: This was the conduct of Diogenes, the hero of our Academicians, whoſe example however they will not follow; Diogenes in this reſpect acted like a true Quaker, that is to ſay, like a wiſe man, who knew the dignity of man, and the inſignificancy of thoſe diſtinctions which we meet with in civil life.

And I would be glad to know too, what meaning you affix to the word *candor*, which you ſay the Quakers make uſe of as a blind? To have *candor*, is to ſpeak unreſervedly from the very heart, which muſt be pure for ſuch a purpoſe—To have *candor* is to ſpeak what you think, and to pay the ſtricteſt attention to truth. This is the general character of the Quakers, and it is a character they have obtained by the ſacrifice of their lives.

But you think very differently; for you charge them with a *whining, inſinuating tone, which is perfectly jeſuitical;* you ſay too, *that their conduct is quite of a piece.* Horrid and falſe compariſon! what do we mean by a Jeſuit? a deceiver, with the air of candor, an artful hypocrite, one who is ambitious and plotting, under the appearance of renouncing honors and riches; a tyrant with an air of ſoftneſs, ſubjection and politeneſs, and one who pretends to be humane, and yet is wholly given to ſelfiſhneſs.

The Jeſuits were inflamed with a deſire of domineering over the conſciences of men, that they might

rule kingdoms, open priſons by their nod, and bury alive their rivals and their enemies—this was *their* reaſon for affecting a *whining inſinuating tone*, which hurts no one's vanity, but flatters and miſleads it.

The Jeſuits raged with the deſire of making proſelytes, they beſieged the growing talents of the youth, and bent them to their own purpoſes; they over-reached great and ſmall; they had ſpies at court, and at the bar; they had their puffers and partiſans in pay. In ſhort they were for attempting and ſubduing every thing.

I would aſk any one, who knows any thing of the Quakers, who has lived ever ſo ſhort a time amongſt them, whether any part of this character ſuits this plain people? can they, who renounce all places and honors, be charged with the luſt of power? can they, who have no ambition, be called plotters? ſhould they be ſuppoſed deceitful, without any motives for being ſo? does not the whole world know, that they do not attempt to make proſelytes! that they do not ſeek for praiſe, either by writing or flattery! every body knows that they deteſt intolerance, and, of conſequence, thoſe horrid methods which are practiſed on perſons in confinement, thoſe private tortures and inquiſitions which the Jeſuits made uſe of to overthrow the doctrine of the *efficacy of grace*. The Quakers have been often derided, mutilated, and impriſoned; they have never treated their enemies in ſuch a manner; can the ſame be ſaid of the Jeſuits?

Is there any thing extraordinary in this ſoftneſs of their manners? does it not naturally accompany their love of humanity, and principles of univerſal toleration? there is nothing in it characteriſtic of the inſinuating ſharper; his ſchemes are for the acquiſition of power, riches, fame or titles; but the true Quaker ſeeks not for power, he is of all men the leaſt deſirous of wealth, he cares little for a name, and deſpiſes all marks of diſtinction.

But you are not ſatisfied with denying them all pretenſions to plainneſs and candor; you are not

ſatisfied with comparing them to one of the moſt ambitious, plotting, and tyrannical ſects that ever exiſted—but you will not even allow them to poſſeſs common honeſty. You tell us, that during the American war, they cheated both parties out of their money, without a bluſh, and careleſs of what might be thought of their conduct.

And yet you bring no proof in ſupport of ſo ſevere an accuſation: an accuſation which affects the whole ſociety; which affects their Benezets and Miffiins: men whom you praiſe, and whom the lovers of virtue will admire. How could you, thus in a moment, endeavour to diſgrace ſo many reſpectable characters? And even admitting, what I neither can nor will believe, till you prove it by well-atteſted facts—admitting, I ſay, that there were ſome Quakers who took advantage of the times, to ſell at exorbitant prices, or, as you expreſs it, to cheat both parties out of their money, was it well done in you, to throw the odium on the whole ſociety? If any amongſt them are culpable, name them; it is your duty to do ſo. You, yourſelf are culpable if you do not; for, indeed, by your ſilence, you involve both the innocent and guilty in the charge.

But as you never could have known the Quaker's methods of dealing; as you never could, nor ever will be able to prove, that they are all cheats, without exception, it follows that your aſſertions are downright defamation; for which you ought to make amends at the public tribunal, where you have unfairly traduced them. At this tribunal, I now impeach you. I, who have been well acquainted with ſome Quakers, and am fully convinced of the general probity of their ſociety, and obſerving, that they are accuſed by a man of rank and quality, and member of ſeveral academies—conſiderations which might lead the public to doubt of the honeſty of the Quakers, I ſummons you to produce your charges, and your proofs before the public; and if you are ſtill ſilent, let me once more repeat it, I ſhall think myſelf authorized to treat your aſſertions as mere defamation.

This word will ſhock you, ſir ; I uſe it with regret ; but I do not uſe it without having ſufficiently attended to the meaning of it. A defamatory work, is one which is made public, in which an avowed or anonymous author, injures one or more perſons, by accuſing them, falſly, of crimes, meanneſſes or vices ; or, in a word, ſtrives to injure their character. Now, do not you accuſe the Quakers of being ſharpers, cheats, hypocrites, and men careleſs of the public good ?

We will ſuppoſe the Quakers may have furniſhed the Engliſh, as well as the Americans, with proviſions. Do you call that a crime ? You ſhould recollect that the Quakers look on all men as their brethren, and that no one is their enemy, not even their perſecutors. In this point of view, Engliſh and Americans were the ſame to them. The greateſt part of them thought that England was carrying on an unjuſt war. But the Quakers did not look on the Heſſians as partners in this act of injuſtice, they thought them equally entitled to their aſſiſtance with their American brethren.

According to my preſent ſentiments, that the only juſtifiable war, is that which is carried on to reſiſt oppreſſion, and that the American war was of this kind, I muſt confeſs I ſhould have been better pleaſed if the Quakers had joined the Americans, that they might the ſooner have got rid of the deſtroyers of their country.

But ſince they have not done ſo, ſince they have ſcrupulouſly adhered to their principles, of not ſhedding blood, I cannot accuſe them of any thing criminal ; and the leſs ſo, becauſe their principles and conduct were known before hand, to both parties *.

And we will ſuppoſe alſo that they may have ſold their goods at a high price to both parties. But do you call this cheating ? In diſcuſſing this charge, I ſhould be

* The Author of this work, propoſes, in a future publication on the the Quakers, to examine into the truth of this charge. And at the ſame time, to take notice of the freſh complaints, made againſt them, by M. Mazzei, Author of *Recherches ſur les Etats Unis*, which he has engaged to do, in his Anſwer to this Writer, already publiſhed.

glad of well ſtated facts. But, as there are none, for you have not furniſhed me with any, I muſt ſuppoſe, that you have been led away, by the common prejudice, againſt the merchant who takes the benefit of circumſtances, to ſell at an advanced price.

When any trade is free, not in the hands of individuals, when the buyer is not forced to give whatever price may be demanded, there can be no cheating, not even if they ſold at the moſt extravagant rates.

The natural conſequence of a war, is to raiſe the price of goods very high, becauſe produce is leſſened, and goods become ſcarce. The ſeller is then no more culpable for raiſing the price on account of the ſcarcity, than the buyer would be for offering a ſmall price in plentiful times. But the common people, who are uſed to fixed prices, and whoſe reſources are diminiſhed in time of war; this common people, who are then forced to buy every thing at a high price, exclaim that they are cheated. And I dare ſay, that a great many of our French officers, in their travels through the United States, have, as well as you, met with poor inns, and bad fare; and yet were obliged to pay a high price, for a mean lodging, and a wretched ſupper. Theſe, I have no doubt, often thought themſelves impoſed upon, and looked upon all the American inn-keepers as cheats. And you, yourſelf, ſeem to inſinuate as much in ſeveral places*. But you and your brother officers were all wrong; For you paid, firſt, for the ſcarcity of hands, and exceſſive price of labour; ſecondly, for the ſcarcity of proviſions; thirdly, for the ſcarcity of travellers; and fourthly, for the ſcarcity of taverns; and, on theſe four different accounts, it is no wonder, if you paid four times as much as in France.

I do not mean to lay before you, in this place, all

* In one place amongſt many others, when ſpeaking of one BESSONET, (whom you miſtake for a brother of BENEZET's,) you ſay, that he retained none of his Quaker principles, but that of ſelling at an extravagant price.

my opinions on high prices †. I ſhall only ſay, that this can never be called cheating, as long as the buyer knows the quality of the goods, and the conditions of ſale: ſecondly where there are many ſellers, the buyer is at liberty to purchaſe, or leave it alone.

The Quakers have the name of ſelling at high rates, I ſuppoſe, becauſe their merchandiſe is always of a good quality. But ſince you are at liberty to provide yourſelf elſewhere, you cannot complain of their ſelling dear; and if you give them the preference, it muſt be becauſe you eſteem their goods, though of a higher price, yet of a ſuperior quality, to thoſe which are ſold at a lower rate.

It is, beſides, very well known, that the Quakers in general ſell nearly at a fixed price. Now, ſuch a cuſtom admits of no cheating, which can only be practiſed by thoſe who vary their charges, and who, by taking advantage of the ignorance and credulity of the purchaſer, aſk much more than the market price. Theſe are the men who are to be miſtruſted, and not the Quakers, who ſell at a fixed rate.

There is then very little probability in your ſlanderous aſſertion, *that it is a received maxim in trade, that they are not to be truſted.*

But I maintain that it is a falſe aſſertion. I have heard quite a different account of them at London—a city, wherein, if they were much inclined to cheating and corruption, they would much ſooner become cheats, and be corrupted, than at Philadelphia. Now, this is far from being the caſe, and it may be looked on as one of the greateſt prodigies of the age, that they have preſerved their virtue in ſuch a ſink of vice.

I dare ſay, you may have heard ſuch an account in America. But would it not have been right for you to have traced out the foundation of this tale? Should you not have ſought for its origin in the

† See my Sentiments on this ſubject, in the Chapter ſur l' Etat civil des Juifs, in the ſecond Volume of the Journal du Licée ou Tableau des Sciences & des Arts en Angleterre. I have there ſaid, that ſelling at a high price is often conſidered as a want of principle, at leaſt, by ignorant people.

wickedneſs and envy * of others ? Should not you yourſelf have been ſure of the truth of it ? And inſtead of only ſaying that the maxim is well founded, ſhould you not have ſhown that it was ſo, by well-atteſted facts ? Once more, ſir ; when a citizen is accuſed of a crime, the proofs and facts muſt be brought forward at the ſame time. Otherwiſe, an accuſation is but calumny, and as ſuch will your's be regarded, unleſs you particulariſe thoſe heavy charges you accuſe the Quakers with, and the whole ſociety at once, for you have ſlandered them all indiſcriminately.

Religious Tenets *of the* Quakers.

I ſhall now go on to treat of the ridicule you throw on the Quakers, when ſpeaking of their mode of worſhip and religious tenets; and here too, I ſhall follow you, ſtep by ſtep.

On Sunday the 10th, ſay you, *I determined to take a turn thro' the churches, and ſtudy the different modes of worſhip.*

It muſt be confeſſed, that your's was a laughable way of *ſtudying ;* to go and hear a ſingle prayer or ſermon, and catch at hazard few expreſſions, in a language and religion you were a ſtranger to. Since all ſects have their peculiar idioms, and make uſe of common words in a different way from other people : the wit, who is for making ſo ſuperficial a courſe of ſtudies, runs a riſk of underſtanding nothing, and of forming erroneous ſentiments of every thing he hears.

But, what could you mean by taking this *ſtrange turn through the churches* ? Was it to become acquainted with their ceremonies? The Preſbyterians have but few—and the Quakers none at all. Was it to become acquainted with the principles and ſpirit of each ſect ? This would have been a more reaſonable

* They have been reproached, ſays Mr. St. John de Crevecœur, vol. 1, page 169, with their fondneſs for trade ; but ſuch charges originate from envy, excited by their riches. The Quakers are for this reaſon the object of public envy in America, and conſequently we need not be ſurpriſed at the many reports concerning them. Have we not ſeen, in the laſt centuries, the poor, proud and envious Chriſtians accuſing the Jews of the moſt horrid crimes, merely becauſe they became rich by trade?

and important object: But let a man be ever ſo penetrating, how can he flatter himſelf with fully underſtanding, in a ſingle hour, at a ſingle opportunity, the principles and practice of any ſect? The firſt is to be learnt from books, the ſecond by frequent and long continued intercourſe.

We are but too much addicted to this mania of judging of objects from ſuperficial views, without going to the bottom of any thing. This is the caſe with reſpect to all the ſciences. A man will ſuppoſe himſelf very knowing in natural philoſophy, and quite a maſter of chymiſtry, when he has attended a few lectures. This error has been already much complained of; but it does and will keep its ground, becauſe it is favorable to the quackery of teachers, and the lazineſs and vanity of ſcholars.

"Unfortunately, ſay you, the ſeveral ſects, *who agree in nothing elſe*, have fixed on *the ſame hour* to aſſemble their congregations."

How can you affirm, that the religious ſects in England, and in the United States, do not agree in any one point; when, all, to bring but a ſingle inſtance, look upon the Goſpel as a divine book; when, all, except the Unitarians, regard Chriſt as the Son of God, and all admit the neceſſity of prayer, &c. You know too much to be ignorant of theſe facts; but you have ſacrificed the truth, to the pitiful pleaſure of making an antitheſis. It is rather ſingular too, that for the accommodation of the curious, you would wiſh to ſubject all the ſects to different hours, for the performance of their worſhip. Alas, why did not you make your *tour* of worſhips, as the petits maitres of Paris do their *tour* of play-houſes? A ſong at the Italian—a ſcene at the French theatre—a dance at the Opera—and a turn at Vauxhall—they have ſeen every thing, and know every thing, for they have ſhewn themſelves every where, and all in the ſpace of two hours.

When you made uſe of this expreſſion, if you had but recollected, that the man, whoſe ſoul is raiſed to God from a feeling ſenſe of duty, has his attention

but little turned to ſtrangers, but is wholly fixed on one object; if you had remembered too, the pernicious conſequences, which, I ſhall hereafter ſhow, attend this way of degrading religious ſubjects, treating them in a light manner, and putting them on a level with play-houſes, you would not have formed a judgment ſo ſuperficially of the Quakers, and Preſbyterians, nor even of the members of the church of England.

If you had recollected too, that there is no diſtinction of ſex in the ſight of God, you would certainly have ſpared that ſorry jeſt upon the women, which no one expected to ſee from the pen of an admirer of the fair ſex, and an academician: "*Like Arioſto, I ſhall relate prodigies*, dirò maraviglia, *juſt as I entered, a woman held her tongue.*"

How could this trifling and hacknied piece of wit eſcape you, eſpecially with all the air of importance with which you make the quotation? You who are ſo warm in the praiſe of our French ladies—have you, then, never been acquainted with any who knew how to be ſtill, or whoſe converſation was agreeable? Have you never lived with Engliſh and American ladies? Have you not obſerved that they are modeſt and ſilent, never in haſte to ſpeak, although well-informed? Yes, well-informed, and well qualified to teach even men of learning and academicians. I ſhall mention but one—Mrs. Macaulay: Her hiſtory of the Stuarts is certainly more uſeful than all the French academy has ever produced.

And beſides, why would you leſſen the women? By undervaluing any one, you make him become deſpicable. The Quakers have done that juſtice to their women which we refuſed them. They have ſhewn they were not unworthy of it; for *Quakeriſm* has had its *Porcias*.

You ſeem determined to find fault with every thing the Quakers do, whether they ſpeak or are ſilent. For you go on to ſay, "A man took the woman's place, and ſpoke *like a block-head on internal grace, the illumination of the ſpirit*, and all the other tenets

of his ſect, which *he had over and over again*, but without explaining any thing.

I ſhall here, ſir, make bold to aſk you if you were ſufficiently acquainted with the language of the ſect, to underſtand this Quaker, and to form a judgment of his diſcourſe? A foreigner may underſtand the eloquent Burke in the houſe of commons, or Miſs Young at the theatre, without being always able to comprehend the preacher of any ſociety. The Quakers, of all others, have a language of their own, which cannot be eaſily underſtood, without having read ſome of their books, ſuch as Barclay's Apology, with a great deal of attention. Now, I ſhould ſuſpect, from a word you have made uſe of, that you were not perfectly acquainted with the idiom and doctrine of the Quakers. It is when you find fault with the preacher for not *explaining their religious tenets*. Moſt probably he was clear enough for his brethren who underſtood his language, while to you who did not comprehend it, he was obſcure. Now on the ſame principles, what would you think of a man, who, having learned the Indoſtan language, only in the grammar of Halhed, ſhould tell us of a Bramin's ſpeaking very ſtupidly about Viſtnou? What would you think of a wit, who, from his ignorance of the new doctrine of magnetiſm, ſhould call your *reflections on motion**, a collection of riddles? And what would you ſay, if an Engliſhman, ignorant of the many hundred revolutions which have happened in the Nomenclator of French chymiſtry, ſhould call the *Oxigine* of Meſſrs. Fourcroy and Lavoiſier, a ſtupid and obſcure term?

It is no difficult matter to accuſe a ſect, or ridicule their tenets. I have ſeen ſome of thoſe jeſters, who could not even tell you the meaning of the technical terms which they had picked up—I have heard many of them quote the doctrines of Janſenius with a ſneer,

* A pamphlet of the Marquis de Chatellux's, publiſhed at the end of Monſ. Bergaſſe's reflections on magnetiſm. This pamphlet has been generally complained of as obſcure and unintelligible.

who would have been greatly puzzled if any one had aſked them to explain the very firſt article.

The ignorant are led away by words, and I make no doubt, that moſt perſons who read your book, and know nothing of the Quakers, will form their judgment of them, from the caricatura you have drawn; from theſe ſingle words "*inward grace, illumination which proceeds from the ſpirit,*" and more eſpecially from the beautiful turn about *ſaying over and over again.* They will exclaim—Where are theſe creatures from?—They are ſurely born in the laſt age—or inhabitants of ſome other world—poor ignorant mortals!

I know nothing of the diſcourſe made by the Quaker you heard preach, but I will confeſs that the tenets he ſhould have ſupported, the tenets of his ſect, do not appear to me to be ſo *ſtupid* as they did to you. I ſhall now give a ſhort account of them, not for your information, for you muſt certainly have read Benezet before you ridiculed him, but for thoſe who have no other knowledge of the Quakers but what they get *from the ſtage.*

The Quakers believe in one almighty, eternal and unchangeable God.

They believe in the divinity and miſſion of Chriſt.

They believe that all men *may* be ſaved.

They *admit* of grace and univerſal light. That is to ſay, that God, of his grace, makes himſelf known, and diſcloſes the truth, to all thoſe who ſincerely deſire to know it, and ſeek after it.

They believe that this grace was given to Socrates, Epictetus and Seneca, and to all thoſe ancient Philoſophers, who joined the practice of virtue to their ſearch after truth. By the inward light, which they follow as their guide, they mean the Holy Spirit.

Whoever, ſays Benezet*, retires ſeriouſly into himſelf, with a ſincere deſire to know, and to do his duty, will never fail to find there a ſure guide, a ray from the fountain of light, which will enlighten his underſtand-

* See a ſhort account of the People called Quakers; their riſe, religious principles, and ſettlement in America, by Anthony Benezet.

ing, and teach him, with certainty, to diſtinguiſh good from evil. Thoſe who are obedient to this light, this divine guide, whatever religion they profeſs, ſoon arrive at the enjoyment of purity, holineſs, *&c.*

The Bible is the principal book which they read, or have recourſe to, for council and direction. They cannot, however, ſays Benezet, regard it as the word of God, becauſe this title belongs to Chriſt alone; becauſe its contents admit of different interpretations, and becauſe men are apt to think that nothing further is neceſſary to their ſalvation.

Concerning worſhip, they have neither ceremonies nor ſacraments, becauſe they ſay theſe terms are not found in the holy ſcriptures.

They do not believe in elementary baptiſm, nor the uſe of bread and wine, as a ſacrament, to be eſſential; they look upon them as types and images; and think a good life is the certain way to ſalvation.

They believe in the neceſſity of prayer, but that it ſhould always proceed from inſpiration.

They keep meetings, becauſe God has promiſed, that where two or three perſons are gathered in his name, there he is in the midſt of them.

They undertake not to ordain either prieſts, biſhops or miniſters, according to the hierarchy maintained in other Chriſtian churches.

They think any man preſumptuous who would pretend to the excluſive privilege of communion with God. Every believer may become a prieſt and miniſter. Every Quaker is a preacher, when he feels himſelf authoriſed thereto by divine inſpiration. They therefore refuſe paying tythes. It is, according to their principles, degrading religion, to make it a matter of commerce; it is diſobeying the Supreme Being, who has ſaid, *freely ye have received, freely give.*

For the ſame reaſon, they reject the ſcience, called theology, as commonly taught in the ſchools, believing that it ſerves only to produce pride and diſputation.

I ſhall in another place ſpeak of their ſentiments concerning war.

It is well known that they never ſwear, according

to the command of Jeſus Chriſt, *ſwear not at all, but let your communication be yea, yea, nay, nay: for whatſoever is more than theſe, cometh of evil.*

The internal police of this ſect is very ſtrict and rational. They have their monthly meetings, which are made up of the members of ſuch meetings as lie contiguous; their quarterly meetings, which are compoſed of the ſeveral monthly meetings, which are neareſt to each other; and in like manner, their yearly meetings, compoſed of the ſeveral adjacent quarterly meetings. If a brother behaves amiſs, the elders caution him repeatedly, and get others to do the ſame. If he is irreclaimable, they lay his caſe before the monthly meeting, where it is judged. He may, if diſſatisfied with their deciſion, appeal from this meeting to the quarterly meeting, where he has another hearing, and from thence, if ſtill diſcontented, to the yearly meeting, where it is finally adjudged. They are careful to avoid law ſuits; if any Quaker is poor, or unfortunate, the ſociety aſſiſts him.*

They look on it as a duty to contribute to general charities.

They hold no places of office in the magiſtracy; but in Pennſylvania they were for ſome time in thoſe offices. Perceiving, however, that it was hardly poſſible to adhere to their principles, amongſt the temptations that occurred there, they at length reſolved to give them up entirely.

Such are the civil and religious tenets of the Quakers; and to their praiſe be it ſpoken, they could never be compelled to abandon them, even in thoſe countries where they were without power, and perſecuted; and they obliged no one to embrace them, where they had the power in their own hands. To prove this, I ſhall quote two ſtriking paſſages, from Barclay and Penn, in their own words:—

"But of this excellent patience and ſufferings, the witneſſes of God, in ſcorn called *Quakers*, have gi-

* I was told, at London, of a Quaker Merchant, who whs thrice relieved by his friends; but failing a fourth time, he was perſuaded to decline trade, and had a penſion ſettled on him.

ven a manifeſt proof: for ſo ſoon as God revealed his *truth* among them, without regard to any oppoſition whatſoever, or what they might meet with, they went up and down, as they were moved of the Lord, preaching and propagating the *truth* in market-places, highways, ſtreets, and publick temples, though daily beaten, whipped, bruiſed, haled, and impriſoned therefore. And when there was any where a church or aſſembly gathered, they taught them to keep their meetings openly, and not to ſhut the door, nor do it by ſtealth, that all might know it, and thoſe who would might enter. And as hereby all juſt occaſion of fear of plotting againſt the government was fully removed, ſo this their courage and faithfulneſs in not giving over their meeting together (but more eſpecially the preſence and glory of God manifeſted in the meeting being terrible to the conſciences of the perſecutors) did ſo weary out the malice of their adverſaries, that oftentimes they were forced to leave their work undone. For when they came to break up a meeting, they * were obliged to take every individual out by force, they not being free to give up their liberty by diſſolving at their command: and when they were haled out, unleſs they were kept forth by violence, they preſently returned peaceably to their place. Yea, when ſometimes the magiſtrates have pulled down their meeting-houſes, they have met the next day openly upon the rubbiſh; and ſo by innocency kept their poſſeſſion and ground, being properly their own, and their right to meet and worſhip God, being not forfeited to any. So that when armed men have come

* During the reign of the infamous Charles IId who made a mockery of every religious ſect, and to procure money, perſecuted and protected them all by turns; a moſt bloody perſecution was excited againſt the Quakers. The King's guards, ſays Mrs. Macaulay, were ſet upon them; they were abuſed, wounded, and ſome were killed. Hays and Jenilt were arreſted for offering money to the conſtables, who were carrying their friends to priſon. They were each of them condemned to pay a fine of £5000 Sterling, or ſuffer impriſonment. Penn and Mead, two reſpectable Quakers, were tried and fined forty marks, for having kept their hats on, &c. Hiſtory of the Stuarts, Vol. 6, Page 309, of the Quarto Edition.

to diſſolve them, it was impoſſible for them to do it, unleſs they had killed every one; for they ſtood ſo cloſe together, that no force could move any one to ſtir, until violently pulled thence: ſo that when the malice of their oppoſers ſtirred them to take ſhovels, and throw the rubbiſh upon them, there they ſtood unmoved, being willing, if the Lord ſhould ſo permit, to have been there buried alive, witneſſing for him. As this patient but yet courageous way of ſuffering made the perſecutors work very heavy and weariſome unto them, ſo the courage and patience of the ſufferers, uſing no reſiſtance, nor bringing any weapons to defend themſelves, nor ſeeking any ways of revenge upon ſuch occaſions, did ſecretly ſmite the hearts of the perſecutors, and made their chariot-wheels go on heavily. Thus, after much and many kind of ſufferings, thus patiently borne, which to rehearſe, would make a volume * of itſelf, which may in due time be publiſhed to the nations (for we have them upon record) a kind of *negative liberty* has been obtained; ſo that at preſent, for the moſt part, we meet together without diſturbance from the magiſtrate. But on the contrary, moſt *Proteſtants*, when they have not the allowance and toleration of the magiſtrate, meet only in ſecret, and hide their teſtimony?" *&c.*†

Barclay relates their ſufferings alſo in his ſpirited dedication to Charles IId, in which he affirms, that no Quaker was ever diſcovered to have been concerned in the many plots laid againſt him; and finiſhes this ſingular dedication with the following bold expreſſions.

" Thou haſt taſted of proſperity and adverſity;

* Charles IId. who trafficked in crimes, and invented them for the ſake of impoſing fines, made a law againſt Diſſenter's Meetings of every kind. If the meeting conſiſted of five perſons, each was fined five ſhillings for the firſt offence, ten for the ſecond, &c. And it was enacted that if any doubt aroſe concerning the meaning of the Act, the Judges were always to decide againſt the defendents. And this was the Tyrant that Louis XIV. wiſhed to inveſt with abſolute power. Mrs. Macaulay's hiſtory, Vol. 6, Page 284, of the Quarto Edition.

† Barclay's Apology, Page 508.

thou knoweſt what it is to be baniſhed thy native country; to be over-ruled, as well as to rule, and to ſit upon the throne; and being *oppreſſed*, thou haſt reaſon to know how *hateful* the *oppreſſor* is, both to God and man: If after all theſe warnings and advertiſements thou doſt not turn unto the Lord, with all thy heart; but forget him who remembered thee in thy diſtreſs, and give up thyſelf to follow luſt and vanity, ſurely great will be thy condemnation, &c."

Theſe paſſages, Sir, are a ſufficient proof of the ſteadineſs and conſtancy of the Quakers, in the midſt of perſecutions; and the ſpirited language of Barclay to Charles the IId, has always been maintained by them. The following paſſage will alſo ſhow their toleration, in a country where they had the power in their own hands.

The immortal Penn, in the charter of privileges, which he granted to the inhabitants of Pennſylvania, on the 28th October 1701, inſerted the following clauſe.

"Becauſe no people can be truly happy, tho' under the greateſt enjoyment of civil liberties, if abridged of the freedom of their conſciences, as to their religious profeſſion and worſhip: And almighty God being the only Lord of conſcience, father of lights and ſpirits; and the author, as well as the object of all divine knowledge, faith and worſhip, who only doth enlighten the minds, and perſuade and convince the underſtandings of people, I do bereby grant and declare, that no perſon or perſons, inhabiting in this province or territories, who ſhall confeſs and acknowledge one almighty God, the creator, upholder and ruler of the world; and profeſs him or themſelves obliged to live quietly under the civil government, ſhall be in any caſe moleſted or prejudiced, in his, or their perſon or eſtate, becauſe of his or their conſcientious perſuaſion or practice, nor be compelled to frequent or maintain any religious worſhip, place or miniſtry, contrary to his or their mind, or to do or ſuffer any other act or thing, contrary to their religious perſuaſion. And that all perſons who alſo profeſs to be-

lieve in Jeſus Chriſt, the Saviour of the world, ſhall be capable (notwithſtanding their other perſuaſions and practices in point of conſcience and religion) to ſerve this government in any capacity, both legiſlatively and executively."

And now, ſir, forget that you have written againſt the Quakers, lay aſide your prejudices and witticiſms, retire within, and after reading the account I have juſt given, aſk yourſelf whether the tenets and worſhip of the Quakers are ſo very ſtupid as you would ſuppoſe them.

But you will ſay, what is the meaning of that myſterious farrago about inward grace, illumination and the ſpirit? I underſtand you, and might anſwer your queſtion by referring to the belief and tenets of the Catholics and Proteſtants, whom your cenſure involves equally with the Quakers; but a philoſopher, an academician, muſt be anſwered in a different manner, and I ſhall now attempt it.

The words illumination, inward grace, extacy, enthuſiaſm, expreſs the ſame ſpiritual ſtate of man, that ſtate in which he is plunged, when abſorbed, and entirely taken up in a profound meditation on his relation to God and man. Were you never in this ſituation? If not, I pity you; for it is certainly the higheſt ſource of happineſs, I had almoſt ſaid, of enjoyment on earth. I will not attempt to deſcribe the effects of it—they are beyond deſcription. Thoſe delightful reveries in which the ſoul wanders, when eſcaped from the wretched coverings which confine her; that ſublime and conſolatory glimpſe of things beyond herſelf, beyond the globe and in a better world, is fled and gone, when we attempt to deſcribe it.

This ſtate is to be arrived at, ſolely, by a perfect inward retirement, and a ſolitary * and innocent life; and

* By a remarkable peculiarity, it happens that enthuſiaſts and illuminated Perſons are oftenеſt found in deſpotic governments. The reaſon is plain, for men are there forced to live a ſolitary life; and when we are unhappy at home, we ſeek for a retreat elſewhere; when the earth is but a place of torment, the wretched look to heaven for relief, and become enthuſiaſts, becauſe it is unſafe to be citizens. There are additional reaſons for reſpecting enthuſiaſm.

can only be reliſhed by thoſe pure ſouls who are liſted above the vain pleaſures and trifling objects of worldly ambition.

This ſtate is the direct road to the knowledge of God, of real happineſs, and of the proper objects of man's purſuit. It leads us naturally to the true means of obtaining it. Theſe means are the public and ſocial virtues. From whence it follows, that the man who is continually employed in ſelf-meditation, becomes of courſe, good, tolerant, juſt and beneficent—for he endeavours to approach the Divinity, and to reſemble him; and it is virtue alone that can fill up the intermediate ſpace which ſeparates them.

Illumination, inward grace, the holy ſpirit of the Quakers, is nothing elſe but this ſtate of knowledge, which is to be attained by meditation. They never pray without meditating--they never preach without being inſpired, which is always the fruit of meditation.

I have then proved to you, that the man who is continually employed in meditation on himſelf, on the Divinity, and on his own duty, will naturally become a virtuous man; and, of courſe, the illumination of the Quakers directs them naturally to virtue; which concluſion is ſupported by facts; of conſequence their ſyſtem is a reſpectable one, and making a jeſt of it, ſhews an ignorance of it's principles and effects—It is an offence againſt virtue.

It ſeems to me that theſe concluſions cannot be denied, however, I challenge you to do it.

I well know that our wits, even ſome of the celebrated ones, have been very ingenious in their ſarcaſms on this ſtate of illumination. But what do ſarcaſms prove? What abſurdity may not a wit be guilty of? What virtue is ſafe from their ridicule? Let us leave irony apart, and come to facts and reaſoning—Turn over Voltaire from beginning to end, the man who has, above all others, brought into repute this rage of ſubſtituting ridicule for reaſoning, and who has carried it even to the ſcaffold. In all his writings,

you will not find one ſolid argument againſt illumination :* His only weapons are puns and epigrams.

It is with regret I mention it, but theſe too, are the weapons moſt frequently made uſe of by the Count de Mirabeau, in the book which he has juſt publiſhed againſt the celebrated Lavater † and his followers, whom he calls the enlightened, and againſt illumination in general.

But there is a diſtinction to be made which has eſcaped this writer, and thoſe who have wrote on the ſame ſubject before him, ‡ and which is daily eſcaping the vulgar who are ſo ready to condemn every thing above their reach—He has confounded the pretended, with the real enlightened man.

I agree that the pretended are the moſt numerous; for whenever there appears in the world characters ſtrongly marked, who announce important truths and fix the attention of mankind, they are ſoon ſurrounded and followed by a crowd of intriguing perſons, who take advantage of their diſcoveries, and who, aping their appearance, hope to dupe the credulous public, and too often are ſucceſsful.

The real philoſopher ought to make the moſt vigorous effors to detect theſe infamous cheats; he ought to inveigh againſt hypocriſy and illumination, when made a trade of, but not againſt real illumination: For by ridiculing this laſt only, they are diſappointed in their aims, they traduce what is reſpectable, and treat with reſpect, or paſs over in ſilence, thoſe things which ſhould be condemned. They give encouragement to

* To do juſtice to Voltaire, it muſt be acknowledged, that he ſometimes ſpeaks well of the Quakers, though in a ludicrous manner. See the words Quakers, and Egliſe primitive in the queſtions ſur l' Encyclopedie.

† Comte de Mirebeau's Letter, on Meſſrs. Caglioſtro & Lavater, Berlin, 1786.

‡ The famous Lord Shaftſbury has publiſhed a letter againſt enthuſiaſm. I have not read the Letter; but by ſketches of it which I have ſeen, it appears that his principal deſign was to prevent the miſchief threatened by ſome falſe prophets, who wiſhed to ſpread deſolation thro' the country, by ſubjecting the minds of the people. His letter ſhould have been entitled, *on falſe* enthuſiaſm.

the hypocrite, who is put on a footing with the virtuous man, and finds a ſhelter under his protection.

But there is, in this caſe, an infallible method of diſtinguiſhing the falſe from the true. Whenever one of theſe enlightened perſons has ambitious, intereſted, or worldly views, you may be certain that he is only a pretender to illumination, and you ſhould never heſitate to detect the *cheat*.

Philoſophy too, has been the inſtrument of cheating in the hands of the ſophiſts. But as it would be abſurd to throw on real philoſophers that odium which belongs only to the cheats who have uſurped this title to acquire riches or reputation, ſo it would be unjuſt to confound George Fox, Penn, Benezet and the reſt of the true Quakers, with the falſe, if there are any, who, as you tell us, make uſe of this covering to conceal their vices and intereſted views. It would be unjuſt to confound the honeſt Lavater with the adventurers who make a trade of illumination and extaſies.

What I now ſay, is equally applicable to the enlightened Catholics—I have no doubt but Fenelon was of this number—That ſweet anointing virtue which runs through his letters, could only be produced by continued extaſies—And who is there ſo devoid of reaſon and feeling as to ſay that Fenelon was a cheat or a fool?

Such a man would at once condemn almoſt every true philoſopher, and eſpecially Rouſſeau. Read this author's dialogues with himſelf; they ſeem to be written in another world: And a man who exiſts in this world only, and has never been beyond it, could not have written two words of them.

Were I to run over the catalogue of ancient and modern philoſophers, there is ſcarce one of them who has not been enlightened, and conſequently been looked upon as a fool by his cotemporaries; this was Plato's caſe; and did not Deſcartes appear as a mad-man, when, in the public church, and preſence of the divinity, he conſecrated himſelf by an oath to the defence of truth. And his pupil, the famous Malebranche, do not all his works bear the wonderful

ſtamp of illumination? He was the child, the man of meditation.

The example of theſe great men will be another proof, ſir, of what I have already demonſtrated, that this ſtate, far from being dangerous to ſociety, is on the contrary, favourable to virtue. For where ſhall we find a more diſintereſted character than Mallebranche, where a more ſublime one than Rouſſeau, where one more beneficent, or more reſembling the divinity, than Fenelon?

And let it be obſerved too, that this diſintereſtedneſs, this ſublimity, this beneficence, were the natural fruits of that habit of ſpiritual contemplation, in which man becomes *ex-organiſed, and ex-humaniſed*, if I may uſe the expreſſions.

In forming a judgment of extraordinary men, I believe we do not pay a ſufficient attention to their private characters; I do not mean, that this ſhould always influence us with regard to their opinions; but it ſhould at leaſt teach us to be careful in paſſing our judgment, and above all things, not to blacken their characters: Their virtue ſhould apologize for their miſtakes, but genius can never be an excuſe for vice.

I am further of opinion, that we are too apt to condemn whatever is foreign to us, and to our way of thinking. The courage of thoſe who dare to ſtrike out new paths, is not held in the eſtimation it deſerves. The good conſequences of enthuſiaſm, excited by new ideas, is not ſufficiently felt.

Every kind of enthuſiaſm is attended with a movement, a diſplacing of the human mind, a flight beyond the ordinary bounds. This is the natural conſequence of the elements of our ſpiritual principle, of it's reſtleſs activity, of it's curioſity to know what is true, and to enjoy the beſt. This active diſpoſition, often leads the ſoul aſtray into errors and chimeras; but on the other hand, it often leads to the diſcovery of uſeful truths. To ſtop the courſe of enthuſiaſm then, by ridicule, is to limit the number of truths, and to circumſcribe human perfection.

But further, the cauſe of tyranny is ſerved by this kind of ridicule ; for ſince there are amongſt theſe truths which have been, or may be diſcovered, ſome that might prove fatal to it ; it is the intereſt of tyrants to oppoſe that enthuſiaſm which cauſes them to be diſcovered, ſpread and adopted. Tyrants, by purſuing this ſyſtem, would make man a mere machine. A Nero, were he now alive, would look with terror upon the preſent ſtate of mens' minds. He would regard them with horror, agitated by a ſecret ferment, continually ſeeking to change their ſituation, tormented with the weight they feel, and endeavouring to free themſelves from it. He would ſee, with horror, ſome launching into the regions of metaphyſics, and there boldly hovering between heaven and earth ; others penetrated with a ſenſe of the dignity of *man*, are ſhocked at the attempts of individuals, to degrade it, all moving with the ſame enthuſiaſm, boldly maintaining their doctrines, and giving riſe to diſcuſſions which tend to the public improvement.

As tyranny is continually obſtructing the progreſs of knowledge, the ſimple and obſcure individual who reſiſts it, muſt have a ſupport, and none ſo certain as enthuſiaſm—Armed with the inward conviction that he is the defender of truth, raiſed above all fear, becauſe he is continually raiſed above all earthly things ; the enthuſiaſt gives a ſhock to the mind, while he himſelf remains immoveable.*

His exiſtence is a real benefit to the community that poſſeſſes him ; he in time makes them partakers of his exalted ſtate. And indeed, enthuſiaſm, tranſporting the minds of men into a more exalted ſphere, habituates them to a certain elevation, which they preſerve when they deſcend into the common circle of things. The en-

* Do you think, ſir, that truth would long maintain it's ground againſt tyranny, in a perſon of an indifferent turn of mind ? If Phalaris had ordered a Geometrician to ſay that two and two made five, he would certainly have been obeyed. But inſtead of Geometry, let us ſuppoſe the matter in queſtion, to have been of a nature, more cloſely connected with the dignity of man, and more ſuſceptible of enthuſiaſm, the tyrant would then have found his miſtake.

thuſiaſt, the enlightened man, have not the ſame language nor the ſame phyſiognomy as common men. Theirs is an heavenly language, a noble countenance, which moſt forcibly electrifies thoſe who look upon it. Obſerve the man who has frequent communion with himſelf and with his God—Serenity reigns on his viſſage and happineſs in his life; there is a ſomething commanding in his looks, which ſeems to make you feel your inferiority—In his preſence vanity ſhrinks, vice bluſhes, and feeble virtue grows ſtrong. Thus, the real and virtuous enthuſiaſt, governs a whole community by his preſence, and by a firm and ſteady *reſolution*.

You, ſir, who have ſtudied the ſecrets of magnetiſm, and who have boldly ranked yourſelf amongſt it's defenders, in ſpite of the academic confederacy, you muſt be well acquainted with the ſingular effects of this *reſolution*, this beneficent enthuſiaſm, in which the whole ſyſtem of magnetiſm conſiſts. Be no longer, then, the enemy of enthuſiaſts and enlightened perſons; make a jeſt of them no longer. I have but one word more to ſay on this head: If the progreſs of George Fox and William Penn had been checked by ridicule, what a miſfortune would it have been for mankind! The American Indians would ſtill be maſſacred; the Negroes would ſtill be ſlaves; the principles of equality and their conſequence, democracy, would not have been ſo well known, and the American revolution would not have been effected: And all this is owing to the ſpirit of illumination and enthuſiaſm.

No longer vilify the worſhip of the Quakers, becauſe you think it gloomy and clowniſh. It is ſimple, and of conſequence more reſpectful to the Deity. It turns the minds of men from idolatry, and by confining them to a ſtate of meditation, fixes their ſerious attention on the ſupreme being, which is of much greater importance than ſinging his praiſes by rote.

No longer ſpeak ſo highly of the Church of England's mode of worſhip, for the reſemblance you ſaw in it to an opera; for the fine pulpit, beautiful organ, handſome miniſter, and elegant women; or for the

agreeable ſonatas you heard ſung there. Good heavens! compare a church to a playhouſe; and the ejaculations of the devout man to the Divinity, to Italian ſongs! How could you deſcend to ſuch puerile and indecent compariſons? It is excuſable in a child to be captivated by fine play-things, but how mean an opinion muſt we entertain of the judgment and metaphyſics of a man grown, an academician too, who calls himſelf a philoſopher, to ſee him looking after and admiring nothing elſe in divine worſhip, but the dreſs of the ladies and the elegant theatrical grace of a ſurpluſed Petit-maitre. For what muſt be your idea of the Divinity, if you ſuppoſe that the prayers and homage of a handſome miniſter and well-dreſſed women, are more acceptable to him, than thoſe of virtuous men, with plain clothes; or that charming ſongs are more acceptable than good works? At any rate, this ſenſual taſte, can only belong to the indolent and voluptuous deities of Epicurus, but the God of the philoſopher is the ſource of all truth and virtue. Does he not receive a more acceptable homage from thoſe who ſeek truth by meditation, and practiſe virtue, than from ſinging and dancing. And is it not uttering blaſphemy againſt him, if it were poſſible to do ſo, thus to ſuppoſe he can be worſhipped by ſtage-players and buffoons?

I by no means charge you with making ſuch concluſions, but would-be-wits, and weak minds, will draw them from your jeſts—How diverted they will be with your curious quotation from the Deſerter, and that compariſon between the ignorant ſectary and Montauciel, who finds in his book, words that were never there. But this is the true academic turn of mind.—Unhappy diſpoſition, which gives us puns and jeſts for reaſons, which leſſens every thing that is great * by the mere touch, which ſhrivels up the ſoul,

* This diſpoſition is to be met with, in many parts of your travels. Another paſſage of the ſame kind is quoted, when you are ſpeaking of the Negroes. I have juſt laid my hands on a third; it is where you are deſcribing the famous natural Bridge, in which you ſee nothing *but nature endeavouring to imitate art*. This is giving much the ſame idea of nature, as the Poet, who in deſcribing the ſublime Meteors of the Alps, tells us

ſhortens the ſight, and disfigures every object! I muſt again lament that the author of la Felicité publique, ſhould be corrupted by this epidemic *rage* for wit.

And you ſuppoſe, then, that you have proved to a demonſtration, that all religious ſects are in an error, by comparing them to Montauciel, who could not ſpell, and by ſaying, that it was a million to one, that he gueſſed right.

Which is as much as to ſay, that *becauſe* Montauciel, who did not know his letters, could not read, ſo we have no method of becoming verſed in the ſciences; *and conſequently*, that we are not poſſeſſed of reaſon, inward feeling or conſcience, thoſe three guides of knowledge and conduct. That, in religious matters, it is a million to one, that the truth is yet concealed, that the true religion is yet unknown, and like to be ſo, for there is a million of chances againſt it. Now is ſuch a ſyſtem as this defenſible? Do you ſuppoſe that there is no ſuch thing as a religious truth? ſuch a ſuppoſition would make the greateſt part of mankind unhappy, and place oppreſſors wholly at their eaſe.

Is there any more appearance of reaſon, in your traducing the Quakers, by charging them with bloody diſputes, and by ſaying that it is better to leave them in their error than to go to cutting throats with them? How is this? do the Quakers endeavour to convince or gain over any one? And do they, when reſiſted, wield the ſword, or light the faggot? You do not believe it; or if you did, hiſtory would undeceive you, and yet, when caſting your jokes on all the ſects, you charge them as well as the others, with this enormity.

There appears throughout this paragraph, an air of ridiculing every religious ſect, as well as of the

that the clouds roſe like the curtain at the Theatre. And this to be ſure is wit! We cannot leſſen or degrade Nature more than by comparing her operations to the feeble works of men. We cannot more certainly deſtroy the intereſting effect, produced in feeling minds, by the ſight of a fine landſcape, a magnificent ſky, or a frightful cataract, than by comparing them to the productions of art.

worſhip of the Deity, which weak minds will extend to the Deity himſelf. Oh ſir, blame not a ſociety for any thing but for their intolerance, and for profeſſing principles which produce hatred: But let us commend them for reſembling one another in believing in God, and in the neceſſity of divine worſhip.

Philoſophers, by being too warm in their oppoſition to certain religious prejudices, have not yet ſufficiently conſidered the extenſive influence which a belief in God and a future ſtate, would have on political conſtitutions: He who believes in God, can fear nobody: He who believes in God, will ſpeak the truth boldly, he will deſpiſe torments and death itſelf: He who believes in God, will love and cheriſh all mankind, he will, if poſſible, revenge them when oppreſt: He who believes in God, may become a Cato, a Sidney, a Benezet, the greateſt and moſt reſpectable of human beings, but he can never become a Cæſar or a Sejancus.

How ſtrong is man when ſupported, on one hand by the truth, and on the other by the Deity! He is then irreſiſtible—Power vaniſhes before him, and the ſword menaces in vain †.

You ſmile—but look at the Quakers; *defenceleſs* they have triumphed over their armed perſecutors—and theſe are the fruits of enthuſiaſm.

† The Hiſtory of England abounds with facts, in ſupport of this aſſertion. I ſhall quote but one. Towards the latter part of the reign, or rather the oppreſſive government, of Charles IId. the ſect of independents appeared, who gave out, that this Prince ought to be dethroned, becauſe he had violated his promiſe made to the nation, who had given him the Crown; had pillaged them in every way he could deviſe; had protected the Papiſts, perſecuted the Proteſtants; received a penſion from France, &c. Theſe complaints were well founded, but Charles choſe rather to ſend a regiment of men againſt theſe ſectarians, than to change his own conduct. They fought like Enthuſiaſts, and Deſperadoes; part of them were killed outright, and the remainder taken priſoners.—Their leaders were executed according to cuſtom; the others were promiſed pardon, on condition of their crying, *God ſave the King*. About fifty men remained, and not one of them would condeſcend to do ſo. They ſaid they would rather die than tell an untruth, or bleſs a man whom they deteſted—and they did die. Hiſtory of the Stuarts, by Mr. Macaulay, Vol. 6, Quarto Edition.

On the POLITICAL PRINCIPLES *of the* QUAKERS.

Have you been more ſucceſsful or juſt, ſir, in your attack upon the political or civil principles of the Quakers? I think not. One of them claims the favour and encouragement of all ſovereigns. They are every where reſpectful and obedient to government, and never revolt, or have recourſe to arms, whatever impoſitions they ſuffer. You do not reproach them for this principle of forbearance, which, perhaps ſingly, prevents crowds of virtuous, but brave men, from embracing their ſyſtem; but you are offended, becauſe in conſequence of it, they proſcribe war, and that military art you ſo ardently admire.

"Concealing, ſay you, their indifference for *the public good*, under the appearance of religion, they are ſparing of blood, *eſpecially their own*, &c."

Thus, ſir, you miſapply words, which ill underſtood, beget abſurd and bloody conteſts. If the diſputes of princes, or the reſpective national pretenſions, often ſupported with the unneceſſary effuſion of blood, conſtitute what you denominate public good; it muſt be confeſſed that the Quakers are indifferent to ſuch follies, and refuſe to contribute to them. But in reſpect to the general benefit of ſociety, that is to ſay, the relief of diſtreſſed individuals, the aſſiſtance of the indigent, zeal and liberality in the promotion of uſeful inſtitutions, the Quakers, far from being indifferent, are among the firſt to comfort and aſſiſt the unfortunate. For proof, I oppoſe you to yourſelf, I quote you for all you allow them to have done for the public good at Philadelphia, where they have principally planned and ſupported many uſeful and neceſſary inſtitutions. For, notwithſtanding they diſcourage public ſpectacles, you will allow that they may promote the welfare of their fellow-citizens, without entertaining them with an opera or a ſtage play. I quote that Benezet, whom you cannot but eſteem, that Mifflin, of whom M. St. John de Crevecœur gives us ſuch an amiable character, that Fothergill, whoſe life was one continued ſcene of great and

good actions, in a word, I quote their general emancipation of the Negroes. Where ſhall we meet with ſuch another ſublime inſtance of regard for the public good! Can you ſuppoſe that the reſtoration of millions of wretched beings to life, to virtue, and to ſociety; and the abolition of the moſt deteſtable trade that ever was undertaken, a trade in human blood! Can you ſuppoſe, I ſay, that theſe are objects of leſs importance to the public welfare than the maſſacre of thouſands of Engliſhmen out of patriotiſm?

Confeſs, ſir, that this kind of public ſpirit deſerves the preference, and no doubt you will be convinced upon ſerious reflection, that the Quakers have ſhewn themſelves friends to the public good, by taking no part as a body in the civil commotions which have laid waſte and diſmembered the Britiſh empire in the laſt and preſent centuries. What! would you blame them becauſe they did not pray for the ſucceſs of that tyrant Charles II, uncorrected by the misfortunes of his father, whoſe wars only ſerved him for a pretence to rob his ſubjects of money to laviſh upon his miſtreſſes? For the ambitious William, who caſt the firſt link of that oppreſſive chain of national debt, whoſe weight becomes at preſent too heavy to be borne? For Ann ſucceſſively governed by ambitious or obſcure favorites, uninformed, intriguing, and a ſtranger to her ſubjects? For the abſurd diſpute about the Spaniſh ſucceſſion, or that of the empire no leſs abſurd and expenſive? In ſhort, would you blame them for not having joined with Clive to aſſaſſinate Nabobs, who had been the benefactors of his country, with Verelſt, to hurry three millions of Indians into eternity by the cruel death of famine, with Haſtings, to exterminate a hundred thouſand Rohillas; in ſhort, with all the ravages of India, to rob, fetter, maſſacre the moſt mild, virtuous and friendly people upon earth.

If this maſs of national enormities, is what you call public good, it is not only a virtue not to ſtain our hands with it; it is a duty to avoid it—confeſs, ſir, that ſuch public good is merely that of a few individuals, of the miniſtry, of the military, who for

amuſement or promotion, charitably ſet people to cut each other's throats. But ſuch public good is a general evil, an evil for all nations, and eſpecially to the people, who are always oppreſſed, whether conquering or conquered. Let us then commend the Quakers for their indifference to ſuch nominal public good; let us commend them for weeping over its calamitous conſequences, though they never contribute to them, and thus uniting religion and humanity.

They are ſparing of blood—ſo much the better—Are there not enough who laviſh it? Are not a million of bayonets at our breaſts from one end of Europe to the other, ſufficient? Are there not murderers enough? Muſt it be counted a crime in the Quakers, not to be found in this liſt of deſtroyers of the human race.

Theſe enlightened men, fully convinced that the baſis of univerſal happineſs is univerſal peace, and that war muſt be utterly renounced to introduce it. Convinced that preaching would be ineffectual, if not ſeconded by example, and that princes would find the means of perpetuating war as long as men could be hired to cut each others throats, determined never to uſe arms or contribute to the ſupport of any war. They have been robbed, impriſoned, tortured, martyred; they endured it all, and at length, overcome by their conſtancy, tyranny has exempted them from military ſervices, and is obliged to uſe force in obtaining contributions from them. And indeed what ſhould the Quakers pay for? To hire ſoldiers? They would there were none. Prieſts? they do not want any; they are all prieſts. Magiſtrates? they need none, they have no law-ſuits.

What would become of our heroe's, if every ſect had imbibed this anti-military ſpirit; if all anathematized war; if no Automaton would ſuffer himſelf to be trained up for the infernal taſk of murdering his brother?—What would become of the ambition of conquerors, if all men, turned Quakers, ſhould firmly, and with one conſent, refuſe to ſecond their pretenſions with a muſket? O then! if we love the public

good, let us pray that this exalted ſect may increaſe and ſpread over the earth, or at leaſt, that its humane principles may be every where received, then would that peace become univerſal*, which the Quakers have already realiſed, in thoſe countries where they are moſt numerous. Let the ambitious who ſigh for ribbands and croſſes, deteſt this idea; let them ridicule us, ſuſpect us of cowardice, and proclaim to the world, that we are ſparing of our own blood; it is better to be ridiculous, if this is ſo, than to become the murderers of our brethren.

It is thus, ſir, you are pleaſed to banter the Quakers; you ſay they ſhun war, particularly *to ſpare their own blood*; as if the Quaker, who uſes no weapons of defence, were not more expoſed to danger than he who carries them and defends himſelf; as if the angry ſavage would reſpect his ſcalp, or the European conqueror his exiſtence.

No, the Quakers do not avoid fighting to ſpare their own blood, but to ſpare that of their fellow men. Can you doubt it, you who have ſeen them during the late war boldly venturing to ſuccour their brethren, their countrymen, their enemies themſelves?

If you ſtill doubt their courage, look back to the perſecutions they have ſuffered, read their martyrology; behold them tranquil and ſerene in dungeons, undaunted before their judges, mounting the gallows without terror; behold even their women, poſſeſſed of equal reſolution, braving torture and defying the executioner†. Such courage, ſir, is very different from

* Men who are prejudiced or intereſted in the exiſtence of reigning evils, ſtigmatiſe thoſe who preach the doctrine of univerſal peace, and oppoſe war with the title of *declaimers*. Notwithſtanding, the world improves under their ſermons, in the act of ridiculing them. Let the partiſans for war, inform us, whether the paſſion for it is ſo general, ſo unbridled in the preſent age, as it was, for inſtance, in the time of the cruſades. War is no longer a raging fever, it is a mere matter of ſpeculation. Now to have changed the rage to computation, is a great ſtep gained; and we have only to prove that war is a bad ſpeculation for *all parties*. To whom is this change of ideas owing, if not to the philoſophers who are called declaimers? The word declaimer, like that of *viſionary* is uſed to turn the man of genius into ridicule, who ſpeaks highly of the rights of men, and boldly oppoſes thoſe errors which the world agreed to laugh at, and continue.

† I will relate one inſtance—Mary Dyar, one of thoſe perſons who returned to Boſton, after their unjuſt baniſhment upon pain of death, when the

that of the ſoldier in the day of battle, chiefly inſpired by the adventitious circumſtances which ſurround him, and poſſeſs every faculty of his ſoul. The confuſed diſcharge of muſketry, and the report of cannon, ſounds which baniſh all reflection, the neceſſity to kill or be killed, the chance of eſcape, the looks of his comrades and of his general, the hope of laurels, and croſſes, every thing ſupports, every thing animates, and impels him to what is called heroiſm; but all this is foreign to it.

How different is the fortitude of the individual, who aſcends the ſcaffold a martyr to his religious or political opinions! every thing around is againſt him, or at leaſt indifferent; the image of certain death before him, and the apparatus of his execution. He has no eſcape, no honors, no ribbands to expect—death advances, and he meets him without terror.

Behold the man of true courage! behold the heroe! His courage is innate, it ſprings from his own breaſt; he dies alone, ſenſible of the approach of death. Such were Ruſſel, Sydney, Barnevelt, De Witt, &c. and all thoſe Quakers who have ſuffered impriſonment and death in defence of their faith. Now will you venture to make a jeſt of their courage, their ſingularities, or the plainneſs of their language?

If the witty, following your example, cannot be ſatisfied without diſparaging this reſpectable ſect by

ſentence was paſſed upon her, undauntedly replied, "the will of the Lord be done;' whereupon, the judge ordered her to be taken away, and ſhe anſwered again, "yea, joyfully I go." At the foot of the ladder, where her two companions ſuffered martyrdom, ſhe cried out, "this is to me an hour of the greateſt joy; no-body can conceive the ſweet and refreſhing influences of the Lord's ſpirit, which I now feel." Ready to meet her diſſolution, ſhe was reſpited and taken back to priſon, from whence ſhe wrote a letter to the general court, charging them with the guilt of innocent blood, in which ſhe ſaid ſhe looked upon their mercy as cruelty. She was baniſhed a ſecond time, but returning to Boſton, was again condemned to die—When the judge repeated her ſentence, ſhe ſaid, "this is no more than what thou ſaidſt before." I am come to warn you to repeal your unrighteous laws: If thou condemneſt me, the Lord will ſend others of his ſervants to witneſs againſt them. A pardon was offered her if ſhe would go away and deſiſt from preaching; ſhe refuſed to do ſo, and ſuffered death.

See the before quoted article upon the Quakers, in my journal.

their ſarcaſtic ſneers—I repeat what I have ſaid elſewhere, I will forgive them their epigrams, if they can ſay on their death-beds, with a deſcendant of the celebrated Penn, " I never did a wicked thing knowingly." I will forgive them, if they can quit life and its enjoyments in the bloom of youth without regret, if they have the reſolution, like moſt Quakers, to comfort their weeping friends—I will forgive them, if they practiſed through life, the meekneſs, probity, and other good qualities of the Quakers. Though they may appear ridiculous in the eyes of a Frenchman, and their language may ſeem emphatic, and enigmatical, even though they ſhould hold immaterial errors, or inſiſt too ſtrenuouſly upon minutiæ; what matter if they are virtuous? Let us ſhun their weakneſſes, but imitate their good qualities, or if we cannot accompliſh both, let us ſacrifice our vanity to virtue, and be very careful how we blame. Hitherto, the Quakers have been repreſented in a ridiculous point of view; both at Paris and London, they have been indecently exhibited upon the ſtage. An Ariſtophanes, has been found to ſacrifice Socrates to the public. Let the public lay aſide their prejudices, let them ſtudy, let them ſcrutinize the Quakers, they will find their doctrines plain, their morals pure, and the ſimplicity of their manners perfectly conſiſtent; they will find energy and ſublimity in their character, in the midſt of general ſeduction and the moſt ſhocking depravity. Even ſelfiſhneſs, that univerſal poiſon, is a vice unknown to the true Quaker. All Quakers are his friends, his brethren—He rejoices in their joy, he weeps for their misfortunes, he ſupports them in their diſtreſs; his friendſhip extends to the whole human race, it is his family, and he delights in doing good to all its members. May ſuch principles ſpread and be imitated, and practiſed by all. But they will find no imitators until men ſhall boldly adopt the ſimplicity of the Quakers, for *luxury cannot be humane*. The income of a Cræſus will always be exceeded by his expences; the man who ſacrifices to pleaſure, rarely enjoys the luxury of doing good.

Three great vices, or rather crimes, have introduced all the evils that afflict the earth ; ſuch as deſpotiſm, war, and public or private injuſtice : They are ambition, covetouſneſs, and luxury—Are not the Quakers, who renounce power, free from Ambition? What object could inſpire covetouſneſs amongſt people who deſpiſe luxury *? This then is the ſect for thoſe States which would baniſh deſpotiſm, and all other political crimes. It is the ſect for republics ; § It is the ſect for monarchies ; In a word, it is the ſect for humanity. Since if Quakeriſm were univerſal, all mankind would form but one loving and harmonious family.

And yet this is the people you calumniate ! but I am not ſurpriſed at it ; the Quakers deteſt the military art, and you are a ſoldier. They undervalue what we call wit, and you have diſplayed your pretenſions to it; you are a member of the royal academy ! They preach equality of men and ranks, and you are a man of quality ‡.

While I was concluding this article, in defence of the Quakers, and when it was almoſt printed off, a Pennſylvanian, who ſincerely eſteems, becauſe he is well acquainted with them, and who is much concerned at your reflections upon them, ſent me the following obſervations—I ſhall tranſlate them in their own ſimple ſtrength, without a comment; they alone would have been ſufficient to refute your aſſertions.

"The reputation of this ſect is founded upon a mul-

* *Si luxuriæ temperares, avaritiam non timeres*, ſaid Tacitus.

† Doctor Franklin, in his obſervations on population, publiſhed in 1751, juſtly obſerves, that thoſe ſects which unite regularity and œconomy with ſimplicity of manners, increaſe the moſt rapidly, becauſe they furniſh them with the means of providing for a numerous offspring. This is the reaſon why the Quakers are ſo numerous in Pennſylvania.

‡ Will it be believed, that theſe obſervations upon the Quakers, as well as thoſe upon the Negroes, to be remarked directly, are particularly noticed in the Journal de Paris, May 21. 1786, as two excellent paſſages. I muſt ſay, to the credit of its reſpectable compiler, Mr. Sautreau, that this article cannot have proceeded from his pen. He is too well acquainted with hiſtory, and is beſides a man of too much veracity, to have written ſuch a panegyric. Nothing but ignorance, or the moſt abject flattery, could have induced any perſon to praiſe ſo many things, that deſerve nothing but blame.

of claims upon an auſterity of manners, and ſteadineſs of principle, unequalled by any other, and particularly upon the good they have done within this century in America."

"The Britiſh act of Parliament, which allows the ſimple affirmation of the Quakers in civil caſes, exempting them from the oath which is required of all other ſects, is the fulleſt eulogium upon their principles, their morals, and their conſtancy."

"Upon an attentive examination of the conſtitutions of their churches, ſchools, hoſpitals and other charitable inſtitutions, there appears a degree of philanthrophy that ſhould diſarm envy and ridicule."

"What father, acquainted with their manner of educating the youth, would not prefer it to that of every other ſect."

"I know of no ſect, which has ſo many intelligent, and even learned members of both ſexes. The enfranchiſement of the Negroes, now a part of their religious diſcipline, is one of the nobleſt monuments ever erected to humanity."

"Beneficence, a general characteriſtic of the Quakers, ſhone with peculiar luſtre in the good John Fothergill, who ſpent his life in healing the ſick, in aſſiſting and comforting the miſerable. This was the firſt man who thought of teaching the wretched inhabitants of the coaſt of Guinea to plant the ſugarcane, inſtead of cultivating it for the whites in a ſtrange land. *"

G

* The following Anecdotes will exhibit the character of this benefactor of mankind. He had a friend at London, who depended upon a ſmall curacy of fifty guineas a year, for the ſupport of a wife and numerous family. The mother and five children were ſeized at once by an epidemic diſtemper. In this diſtreſſing ſituation, the Curate would not apply to Fothergill, becauſe he had nothing to fee him with. Mentioning his ſituation to one of his friends, he offered to pay the fees. They went together to the Doctor, who refuſed a fee, but viſited the diſtreſſed family, till he had effected a cure.

The Curate knew not how to expreſs his gratitude; but what was ie ſurprize, when Fothergill, inſtead of receiving any pecuniary compenſation, preſented him with ten guineas, and deſired him to apply to him when he wanted more.

The other Anecdote, concerning the School at Ackworth, it is too

" But ſurely calumny ſhould ceaſe to perſecute the Quakers, at the appearance of Anthony Benezet, whoſe whole life was conſecrated to the ſervice of his fellow creatures; humble, plain, unoſtentatious, regardleſs of ridicule, danger, or prejudice, he was continually employed in ſerving others, rarely himſelf."

" He died univerſally regretted, in 1784. The citizens of Philadelphia attended his funeral; and upwards of four hundred Negroes, who owed him their liberty, and whom he had inſtructed himſelf, bedewed his coffin with their tears. This benefactor of the blacks, deſirous to ſerve them even after his death, left his whole fortune for the ſupport of the ſchools he had eſtabliſhed for their inſtruction, with a view to make them more worthy of that freedom which had been granted them by the excellent law of 1780."

" It is alſo to his zeal in part, that we are indebted for the exiſtence of the ſociety lately inſtituted for facilitating the manumiſſion of the blacks, and protecting thoſe who are, or may become free."

You knew, Sir, you converſed with this wonderful perſon, this angelic benefactor of mankind, and yet you ventured to traduce the Quakers! Did not his ſpirit confuſe your imagination, while your pen was falſifying his brethren, thoſe whom he cheriſhed and led by the hand; did not your own heart aſk you, can Benezet belong to a band of rogues and hypocrites? Is it poſſible that his noble reply on your telling him of our rich livings, of an hundred thou-

long to relate here; but I will give the outlines of it. This foundation is now very flouriſhing. Fothergill ſet a ſubſcription on foot, and was himſelf a principal ſubſcriber, for the purchaſe of the land, the buildings, and eighty acres of ground for its ſupport. There are now three hundred Scholars upon this foundation; all properly boarded, cloathed and educated, for the ſeveral profeſſions they are intended to follow. They are taught morality, decency, regularity, ſubordination to their ſuperiors, forbearance towards each other, and eſpecially that habit of ſilence and meditation ſo much recommended in the ancient ſchools of philoſophy, and which are abſolutely neceſſary for the attainment of real ſcience. See the life of Fothergill, by the Doctors, Hird and Elliot.

ſand livres a year " that would build a great many hoſpitals." Is it poſſible I ſay that this itſelf could not diſarm your rigor? It does not indicate the warm benevolence of one man only, it breathes the ſpirit of his brethren. Such fervency is not to be found in a declining ſect; it no longer inſpires it. Benezet could not have been the member of a corrupted body. His fervent charity would form too ſtriking a contraſt to the ſelfiſhneſs of hypocriſy.

VINDICATION *of the* NEGROES.

Firſt let me repeat your longeſt ſection relative to that people.

' Below this claſs of inhabitants, (the whites of no ' property, in Virginia,) we muſt rank the Negroes, ' who would be ſtill more to be pitied, if their *natu-* ' *ral inſenſibility did not in ſome meaſure alleviate the* ' *wretchedneſs inſeparable from ſlavery*. Seeing them ' ill lodged, ill clothed, and often overcome with la- ' bour, I concluded that their treatment had been as ' rigorous as it is elſewhere. Notwithſtanding I have ' been aſſured that it is very mild, compared to what ' they ſuffer in the Sugar Colonies. And indeed one ' does not hear *habitually*, as at Jamaica and St. Do- ' mingo, the ſound of whips, and the outcries of the ' wretched beings, whoſe bodies are torn piece meal ' by their ſtrokes. It is becauſe the people of Virginia ' are commonly milder than thoſe of the Sugar Colonies, ' which conſiſt chiefly of rapacious men, eager to amaſs ' fortunes, as ſoon as poſſible, and return to Europe. ' The produce of their labours being alſo leſs valuable, ' their taſks are not ſo rigorouſly exacted, and in juſtice ' to both, it muſt be allowed that the Negroes them- ' ſelves are leſs treacherous and thieviſh, than they ' are in the Iſlands: for the propagation of the black ' ſpeices being very conſiderable here, moſt of them ' are born in the country, and it is remarked that ' theſe are in general *leſs depraved* than thoſe import- ' ed from Africa. Beſides, we muſt do the Virgini- ' ans the juſtice to remark, that many of them treat

'their Negroes with a great deal of humanity, and 'what is ſtill more to their honor, they appear ſorry 'there are any among them, and are forever talking 'of aboliſhing ſlavery, and falling upon ſome other 'mode of improving their lands, &c.

'However this may be, it is fortunate that differ-'ent motives concur to deter mankind from exerciſ-'ing ſuch tyranny, at leaſt upon their own ſpecies, if 'we cannot ſay, ſtrictly ſpeaking, *their equals;* for the 'more we obſerve the Negroes, the more we are con-'vinced that the difference between us *does not lie in 'the colour alone*, &c.

'Enough upon this ſubject, which has not eſcaped 'the attention of the politicians and philoſophers of 'the preſent age: I have only to apologize for 'treating it without declaimation; but I have al-'ways thought, that eloquence can only influence 'the reſolutions of the moment, and that every thing 'which requires time, muſt be the work of reaſon. 'And beſides, it will be an eaſy matter to add ten or 'twelve pages to theſe few reflections, which may 'be conſidered as a concert compoſed only of prin-'cipal parts, *con corni ad libitum.*'

Upon reading this paſſage attentively, I was ſurpriſed to find it contain a ſingular mixture of contradictory principles, and in the ſame breath, the ſentiments of a philoſopher and of a coloniſt; of an advocate for the Negroes, and of their enemy.

It is evident that as a philoſopher, and a friend to humanity, you are inclined to alleviate the lot of the Negroes, and commend thoſe who do ſo; but this tenderneſs itſelf conceals a ſubtile venom that ought to be expoſed. For you only beſtow your pity upon the Negroes, while you owe them, if you are a philoſopher, vindication and defence; you wiſh their maſters to be humane; they ought to be juſt. Inſtead of praiſing ſuch humanity, you ought to have blamed them for ſtopping there, in ſhort, ſuch a contempt for the Negroes pervades this whole article, as will neceſſarily encourage their tormentors to rivet their

chains. Is not this contempt obſervable, for inſtance, in the very firſt period?

"Below this claſs of inhabitants (the meaneſt whites of Virginia) we muſt rank the Negroes, who would be ſtill more to be pitied, if their *natural inſenſibility did not in ſome meaſure alleviate the wretchedneſs inſeparable from ſlavery.*"

And who told you, Sir, that nature had created the Negroes with leſs feeling than other men? do you judge ſo becauſe they have vegetated for three centuries in European fetters, and at this day have not *altogether* ſhaken off the horrid yoke? But do not their frequent riſings, and the cruelties they from time to time retaliate upon their maſters, give the lie to this natural inſenſibility? for an inſenſible being has no reſentment. If he does not feel, how ſhould he remember? Do you think the wretched Indians, who, ſince the diſcovery of the new world, are buried in the mines of Peru, are alſo naturally inſenſible, becauſe they ſuffer patiently?

You calumniate nature in making her grant favours to particulars; in giving her a ſyſtem of inequality among her offspring. All men are caſt in the ſame mould—The varieties which diſtinguiſh individuals, are the ſports of chance, or the reſult of different circumſtances; but the black comes into the the world with as much ſenſibility as the white, the Peruvian, as the European.

What then degrades this natural and moral ſenſibility? The greater or leſs privation of liberty; in proportion as man loſes it, he loſes the powers of ſenſation; he looſes the man; he ſickens or becomes a brute. It is ſlavery alone which can reduce a man to a level with the brute creation, and ſometimes deprives him of all ſenſibility; but you blame nature, that kind parent, who would have us all equal, free and happy, for the crime of ſocial barbarity, and you paſs by this crime, to extenuate another, to extenuate the horrid torments of ſlavery! Not ſatisfied with violating nature, by abuſing her offspring, even in her name, you encourage ſlave-holders to torment them.

Do you not arm their tyrants, when you tell them, the inſenſibility of the Negroes alleviates their torments?

What! becauſe greatneſs of ſoul raiſed Sidney above the terrors of death, the infernal Jefferies * who cauſed his execution, was leſs guilty! becauſe the Quakers appeared inſenſible to inſults, blows, or puniſhments, they are leſs to be pitied, and it was right to martyr them! A dangerous notion, whoſe conſequences I am ſure you would diſapprove. If this inſenſibility with which you reproach the Negroes mitigated the cruelty of their maſters, it were well: but their tormentors do not wiſh them not to feel; they would have them all feeling, for the pleaſure of torturing them; and their puniſhments are increaſed in proportion to their inſenſibility.

"Seeing the Negroes, ſay you, "ill lodged, ill cloathed, and often overcome with labour, I concluded that their treatment had been as rigorous as it is elſewhere. Notwithſtanding I have been aſſured that it is very mild, compared to what they ſuffer in the Sugar Colonies."

Why this compariſon, which ſeems to inſinuate a juſtification of the Virginians? does a misfortune ceaſe to be ſuch, becauſe there is a greater elſewhere? Was Cartouche leſs deteſtable becauſe Brinvilliers had exiſted before him? Let us not weaken by compariſons the idea of criminality, nor leſſen the attention due to the miſerable, this were to countenance the crime. The Negroes are ill lodged, ill cloathed, oppreſſed with labour in Virginia: this is the fact, this is the offence. It matters not whether they are worſe treated elſewhere; in whatever degree they are ſo in Virginia, it is ſtill outrage and injuſtice.

And again, why are the Negroes of Virginia leſs

* This Jefferies was the moſt infamous Chief Juſtice that ever exiſted in England. Charles IId. and James IId. well acquainted with his talents for chicane, his debauchery and blood-thirſtineſs, his baſeneſs and his crimes, made uſe of him to exterminate, with the ſword of law, all thoſe worthy men who defended the conſtitution from their tyranny.

I often quote the Hiſtory of England; unhappily for us it is too little known in France.

cruelly treated? Humanity is not the motive, it is becauſe covetouſneſs cannot obtain ſo much from their labours, as in the Sugar Iſlands. Was it otherwiſe, they would be ſacrificed to it here, as well as there; how can we praiſe ſuch forced humanity? how, on the contrary, not give vent to all the indignation, which muſt naturally ariſe in every feeling mind?

"And to do juſtice to both, you add, if the Virginians are not ſo ſevere, it is becauſe the Negroes themſelves are leſs treacherous and thieviſh than in the iſlands, becauſe the propagation of the black ſpecies being very conſiderable here, moſt of the Negroes are born in the country, and it is remarked, that theſe are in general leſs depraved than thoſe imported from Africa."

Here is a ſtrange confuſion of cauſes and effects, and a ſtrange abuſe of words. Firſt let us clear up the facts. Here are ſome valuable ones for the cauſe of the Negroes.

You ſay they are not ſo thieviſh in Virginia, propagate faſter, and are leſs depraved: Why? Becauſe they are leſs cruelly treated—Here is the cauſe and the effect, you have miſtaken one for the other.

We muſt conclude from this fact, that if the Virginians were no longer ſevere, and ſhould treat the blacks like fellow-creutures, they would not be more vicious than their white ſervants.

The degree of oppreſſion is the meaſure of what is improperly called the viciouſneſs of the ſlaves.—The more cruel their tyrants, the more treacherous, villainous and cruel are the ſlaves in return—Can we wonder that Macronius ſhould aſſaſſinate his maſter Tiberius? This viciouſneſs is a puniſhment that heaven inflicts upon tyranny.

Can the efforts of a ſlave for the recovery of his liberty, be denominated vicious or criminal? From the moment you violate the laws of nature, in regard to them, why ſhould not they ſhake them off in their relative duties to you? You rob them of their liberty, and you would not have them ſteal your gold! You whip and cruelly torment them, and expect them not

to ſtruggle for deliverance! You aſſaſſinate them every day, and expect them not to aſſaſſinate you once! You call your outrages, rights, and the courage which repulſes them, a crime! What a confuſion of ideas! what horrid logic!

And you, ſir, a humane philoſopher! are acceſſary to this injuſtice, by deſcribing the blacks in the ſtyle of a dealer in human fleſh! You call what are no more than natural conſequences of the compreſſion of the ſpring of liberty—treachery, theft and depravation*. But can a natural conſequence be criminal? Remove the cauſe, or is it not the only crime?

For my part, ſir, I firmly believe, that the barbarities committed by the Negroes, not merely againſt their maſters, but even againſt others, will be attributed at the bar of eternal juſtice, to the ſlave-holders, and thoſe infamous perſons employed in the Guinea trade. I firmly believe, that no human juſtice has the right of putting a Negro ſlave to death for any crime whatever, becauſe not being free, he is not ſui juris, and ſhould be regarded as a child or an idiot, being almoſt always under the laſh. I believe that the real criminal, the cauſe of the crime, is the man who firſt ſeized him, ſold him, or enſlaved him—And if ever I ſhould fall under the knife of an unhappy runaway, I would not reſent it upon him, but upon thoſe white men who keep blacks in ſlavery. I would tell them, your cruelty towards your Negroes, has endangered my life—they execrate you, they take me for a tyrant becauſe I am white like you, and the vengeance due to your crimes has fallen upon me.

God forbid, however, that I ſhould undertake to encourage the blacks to take up arms againſt their

* Moſt authors who have not deeply ſtudied the rights of men, fall into this error. I have remarked elſewhere [Vol. II. of the Journ. du Licée, no. 4, page 222.) that a writer, who notwithſtanding, deſerves our eſteem, for having written againſt the deſpotiſm of the Turkiſh government, has ſuffered himſelf to be drawn into it. M. le Baron de Tott ſays, that the Moldavians are thieviſh, mean, and faithleſs. To tranſlate theſe words into the language of truth, we muſt ſay, the Turks, the maſters of the Moldavians, are unjuſt, robbers, villains, and tyrants; and that the Moldavians revenge themſelves by oppoſing deceit to oppreſſion, &c. Thus, the people are almoſt every where wrongfully accuſed.

maſters! God forbid, however, that I ſhould undertake to juſtify the exceſſes to which their reſentments have ſometimes hurried them, and which have often fallen on perſons who were not acceſſary to their wretchedneſs! The ſlavery under which they groan, muſt be aboliſhed by peaceable means; and thanks to the active ſpirit of benevolence which animates the Quakers, the pious undertaking is already begun. In moſt of the United States of America, the yoke has been taken from their necks; in others the Guinea-trade has been prohibited. Societies have been formed both at Paris and London, to collect and circulate information upon this intereſting ſubject, to induce the European governments to put a ſtop to the Negro trade, and provide for their gradual emancipation in the Weſt-India iſlands: No doubt ſucceſs will crown their views, and the friends of liberty will enjoy the ſatisfaction of communicating its bleſſings to the blacks.

But the blacks muſt wait for the happy moment that ſhall reſtore them to civil life, in ſilence and in peace; they muſt rely upon the unwearied diligence and zeal of the numerous writers who advocate their cauſe, and the efforts of the humane to ſecond their endeavours; they muſt ſtrive to juſtify and ſupport the arguments that are adduced in their favour, by diſplaying virtue in the very boſom of ſlavery; they muſt endeavour, in a word, to render themſelves worthy of liberty, that they may know how to uſe it when it ſhall be reſtored to them; for liberty itſelf is ſometimes a burthen, when ſlavery has ſtupified the ſoul.

Such blacks, therefore, as are ſo inconſiderate as to be concerned in inſurrections, are guilty of retarding the execution of the general plan for their emancipation; for the queſtion is not, at the preſent day, whether a million of ſlaves ought to be ſet at liberty, but whether they can when free, be put into a capacity of providing for the ſubſiſtence of themſelves and their families. Inſurrections, far from effecting this purpoſe, would deſtroy the means. Regard, therefore, to their own intereſts, if there were no

other motive, ſhould therefore engage the blacks to patient ſubmiſſion, and no doubt but they will yield it, if their maſters and the miniſters of the goſpel in particular, to whom the taſk of comforting and inſtructing them, is committed, endeavour to prepare them for approaching freedom.

You ſir, have adopted the vulgar notion, that the Negroes born in Virginia, are leſs depraved than thoſe imported from Africa. You call the firmneſs which is common in the early ſtages of their ſlavery, *greater degeneracy ;* they are depraved, that is, in your language—they are wicked and treacherous to thoſe who have purchaſed them, or brought them from their own country—But in my mind, they are not depraved, becauſe the acts of violence their genius inſpires them to revenge themſelves upon their tyrants, are juſtified by the rights of nature.

And why are thoſe imported, more wicked in your opinion ? In mine, more quick, more ardent in their reſentments ? becauſe, not having forgotten their former ſituation, they feel their loſs the more ſenſibly; and having ſtrong ideas, their reſolutions are more firm and their actions more violent, they not having yet contracted the habits of ſlavery.

They ſoon fall into that degree of apathy and inſenſibility, which you unjuſtly believe to be natural to them ; that is, in your language, they become leſs depraved ; but I would ſay that their depravity begins with this apathy and weakneſs—For depravity is the loſs of nature, and the want of thoſe virtues inherent in man, courage and the love of liberty. Our readers may judge from this article, how ſtrangely writers have wreſted words to condemn theſe unhappy Negroes, and the unfortunate in general.

I do not, however, pretend to ſay, that the Negroes of Africa are all good, or even that many of them are not depraved. But is this fact to be imputed to them as a *perſonal* crime ? Ought you not rather to have aſcribed it to the foreign ſource by which they are corrupted. Alike in them and in the whites,

the depravity of man is a conſequence of his wretchedneſs, and the uſurpation of his rights. Wherever he is free and at eaſe, he is good; wherever the contrary, he is wicked. Neither his nature nor the climate corrupt him, but the government of his country. Now that of the Negroes is almoſt univerſally deſpotic, ſuch as muſt neceſſarily debaſe and corrupt the Negro.

How much is the depravity, occaſioned by the government of his country, encreaſed by his ſecond ſlavery, far worſe than the firſt—for he is no longer among friends in his native land—ſurrounded by the pleaſing ſcenes of his childhood, he is among monſters who are going to live by, and trade in his blood, and has nothing before his eyes but death, or oppreſſion equivalent to an endleſs puniſhment.

How is it poſſible ſuch horrid proſpects ſhould not fire his ſoul? How, if chance ſhould preſent him with arms and liberty, ſhould he reſiſt uſing them, to put an end to his own exiſtence, or that of his tormentors? What white man would be leſs cruel in his ſituation? Truly I think myſelf of a humane diſpoſition, that I love my fellow-creatures and deteſt the effuſion of blood; but if ever a villain, white or black, ſhould ſnatch me from my freedom, my family, and my friends; ſhould overwhelm me with outrages and blows, to gratify his caprice, ſhould extend his barbarities to my wife and children—My blood boils at the thought—perhaps in a tranſport of revenge * * * * * * * * If ſuch vengeance would be lawful in me, what makes the Negro more guilty? Why ſhould that be called wickedneſs and depravity in him, which would be ſtiled virtue in me, in you, in every white man? Are not my rights the ſame as his? Is not nature our common parent? God his father as well as mine? His conſcience an infallible guide as well as mine? Let us then no longer make other laws for the blacks than thoſe we are bound by ourſelves, ſince Heaven has placed them on a level with us, has made them like us, ſince they are our brethren and our fellow-creatures.

Here you ſtop me, you ſay that *the Negro is not our fellow-creature, that he is below the white.*

How could ſo ſhocking an opinion eſcape the pen of a member of the Royal Academy, a writer who would be thought a friend of mankind!

Do not you ſee the tormentors of St. Domingo, avail themſelves of it already, redoubling their ſtrokes, and regarding their ſlaves as mere machines, like the Carteſians do the brutes? They are not our fellow-creatures will they ſay: a philoſopher of Paris has proved it.

What! the blacks not our equals! Have not they eyes, ears, a ſhape, and organs like ours? Does nature follow another order, other laws for them?—Have not they ſpeech, that peculiar characteriſtic of humanity? But then the colour! What of that? Are the pale white Albinos, the olive or copper coloured Indians alſo of different ſpecies! Who does not know that colour is accidental. They are not our equals! Have not they the ſame faculties—reaſon, memory, imagination? Yes, you reply, but they have written no books. Who told you ſo? Who told you there were no learned blacks? And ſuppoſing it were ſo, if none but authors are men, the whole human race is different from us.

Shall I tell you why there are no authors or men of learning among the Negroes? What has made you what you are? Education and circumſtances!—Now where are the Negroes favoured by either? Conſider them wherever they are to be found—In Africa, wretchedly enſlaved by domeſtic tyrants; in our iſlands perpetual martyrs; in the ſouthern United States, the meaneſt of ſlaves; in the northern, domeſtics; in Europe, univerſally contemned, every where proſcribed, like the Jews; in a word, every where in a ſtate of debaſement.

I have been told that there are blacks of property, in the northern parts of America; but theſe, like the other ſettlers, are no more than ſenſible farmers or traders—There are no authors among them, becauſe there are few rich and idle people in America*.

* There was however, a Negro author at London, whoſe productions are not without merit, and were lately publiſhed in two volumes—His name was Ignatius Sancho—He wrote in the manner of Sterne.

What ſpring of action could raiſe a Negro from his debaſed condition? the road to glory and honor is impaſſible to him: What then ſhould he write for? Beſides, the blacks have reaſon to deteſt the ſciences, for their oppreſſors cultivate them but they do not make them better.

Shall we ſay that the Indians or Arabs are not our equals, becauſe they deſpiſe both our arts and our ſciences? or the Quakers, becauſe they neither reſpect academies nor wits?

In ſhort, if you will deny the Negroes ſouls, energy, ſenſibility, gratitude or beneficence, I oppoſe you to yourſelf, I might quote your own anecdote of Mr. Langdon's Negro, and abundance of other well known facts in favour of the blacks. You may find ſome ſtriking ones in the Abbé Raynals' philoſophical hiſtory. One of them would have been ſufficient. The Negroe who killed himſelf when his maſter who had injured him was in his power, was ſuperior to Epictetus, and the exiſtence of a ſingle Negro of ſo ſublime a character, ennobles all his kind.

But how could you judge whether the blacks were different from the whites, who ſaw them only in a ſtate of ſlavery and wretchedneſs? Do we eſtimate beauty by the figure of a Laplander? magnanimity by the ſoul of a courtier? or intelligence by the ſtupidity of an Eſquimaux?

If the traces of humanity were ſo much weakened and effaced in the Negroes, that you did not recognize them, I conclude not that they do not belong to our ſpecies, but that they muſt have been cruelly tormented to reduce them to this ſtate of degeneracy. I do not conclude that they are not men, but that the Europeans who kidnap the blacks, are not worthy of the name.

You conſider what precautions it may be neceſſary to take to avoid the danger which might attend a general emancipation of the Negroes.

I ſhall not now enter into a diſcuſſion of this nice queſtion, but reſerve it for another work: yet I muſt ſay in a word, that the Negroes will never be our

friends, will never be men, until they are poſſeſſed of all our rights, until we are upon an equality. Civil liberty is the boundary between good and evil, order and diſorder, happineſs and miſery, ignorance and knowledge. If we would make the Negroes worthy of us, we muſt raiſe them to our level by giving them this liberty.

Thus, the chief inconvenience you expect will follow the emancipation of the Negroes, may be avoided ; that although free, they will remain a diſtinct ſpecies, a diſtinct and dangerous body.

This objection will vaniſh when we intermix with them, and boldly efface every diſtinction. Unleſs this is the caſe, I foreſee torrents of blood ſpilt and the earth diſputed between the whites and blacks, as America was between the Europeans and Savages.

Perhaps, and it is no extravagant idea—perhaps it might be more prudent, more humane, to ſend the blacks back again to their native country, ſettle them there, encourage their induſtry, and aſſiſt them to form connections with Europe and America. The celebrated doctor Fothergill conceived this plan, and the ſociety for the abolition of ſlavery, at London, have carried it into execution at Sierra Leona. Time and perſeverance, will diſcover the policy and utility of this ſettlement. If it ſhould ſucceed, the blacks will quit America inſenſibly, and Sierra Leona become the centre from whence general civilization will ſpread over all Africa.

Perhaps, ſir, you will place theſe thoughts upon the Negroes with thoſe declamations you are pleaſed to ridicule : But what is the epithet of declaimer to me, if I am right, if I make an impreſſion upon my readers, if I dart remorſe into the breaſt of a ſingle ſlaveholder ; in a word, if I contribute to accelerate the general impulſe toward liberty.

You diſapprove the application of eloquence to this ſubject ; you think nothing can affect it but the exertions of cool reaſon. What is eloquence but the language of reaſon and ſenſibility ? When man is oppreſſed, he ſtruggles, he complains, he moves our paſſions, and bears down all oppoſition. Such eloquence

can perform wonders, and ſhould be employed by thoſe who undertake to plead the cauſe of the unfortunate who ſpend their days in continual agony, or he will make no impreſſion—I do not conceive how any man can diſplay wit inſtead of feeling, upon this diſtracting ſubject, amuſe with an antitheſis, inſtead of forcible reaſoning, and only dazzle where he ought to warm. I have no conception how a ſenſible and thinking being, can ſee a fellow-creature tortured and torn to pieces, perhaps his poor wife bathed in tears, with a wretched infant ſucking her ſhriveled breaſt at his ſide; I ſay I have no conception how he can behold ſuch a ſight, with indifference; how, unagonized and unconvulſed with rage and indignation, he can have the barbarity to deſcend to jeſting! Notwithſtanding, your obſervations upon the Negroes, conclude with a jeſt.

"It will be an eaſy matter, ſay you, to add ten or twelve pages to theſe few reflections, which may be conſidered as a concert, compoſed only of principal parts, "*con corni ad libitum.*"

I hope there is nothing cruel, becauſe there is nothing ſtudied in this connection, this inconſiderate manner: but how could ſuch a compariſon come into the head of a man of feeling? It is the ſad effect of wit, as I ſaid before; it contracts the ſoul. Ever glancing over agreeable objects, it is unfeeling when intruded upon by wretchedneſs—uneaſy to obliterate the ſhocking idea, and elude the groans of nature, it rids itſelf of both by a jeſt. The humane Benezet would never have connected this idea of harmony with the ſound of a Negro driver's whip.

Having proved that you have wronged the Quakers and the Negroes, I ſhall proceed to ſhew that you have equally injured mankind and the people.

VINDICATION *of* MANKIND, *and of the* PEOPLE.

I might quote ſeveral paſſages on this ſubject, but the following, which is one of the moſt ſtriking, will be ſufficient. After giving a deſcription of an Iriſh-

man, who had treated you with a *good dinner*, you proceed.

'He was polite and attentive, and his wife, a de-
'licate, pretty woman, had nothing of the peaſant
'in her air or manners; for the Virginian, though in
'the midſt of the woods, and cares of a country life,
'bears no reſemblance to the European Peaſant—He
'is univerſally a free man, who has his ſhare in
'the government, and *poſſeſſes ſome Negro ſlaves;* ſo
'that he enjoys the double title of Citizen and Maſter;
'in which reſpect he is quite on a footing with the
'generality of thoſe who compoſed that order which
'was called the People in the ancient republics, a Peo-
'ple very different from thoſe of the preſent day; but
'who have been very improperly confounded in all
'thoſe *trifling declamations*, wherein our *would-be philo-*
'*ſophical* writers, by not making a proper diſtinction
'between ancient and modern times, have miſtaken
'the word People for Mankind in general; and have
'really been liberal in their praiſes to tyrants, when
'they meant to defend the cauſe of humanity: num-
'berleſs are the opinions which require correction!
'numberleſs are the words, whoſe proper meaning is
'yet undefined! The favourite phraſe of the dig-
'nity of man, has long been made uſe of; and
'yet this *dignity of man is merely comparative;* if applied
'to individuals, it depends on the rank they hold in
'life. Thus, the inferior ſtation of the common
'people, gives dignity to the nobility, that of the
'ſlave to the freeman, and that of the blacks to the
'whites.

'If we apply it in a general ſenſe, it will make men
'tyrannical and cruel to the animal creation; and thus,
'by deſtroying univerſal beneficence, will counteract
'the order and deſigns of nature—On what founda-
'tion then ſhall reaſon, freed from ſophiſtry and de-
'clamation, fix her ſeat? On an equality of rights,
'on the general good, which is to predominate over
'every thing elſe; on the good of individuals as united
'with the good of the whole; and on that order in ſo-
'ciety, as abſolutely neceſſary as the ſymmetry of a

'bee-hive, &c.—If theſe ſentiments are unfavourable 'to eloquence, we ſhall loſe nothing by it; for a good 'ſyſtem of morality is certainly preferable to an ele-'gant one ‡.'

And ſo, ſir, you think the people of the preſent day, are a very different ſet of beings from the people of old times, and of conſequence, more diſpoſed to and fit for ſlavery—And you blame our philoſophers too, for putting the people of our day more on a level with thoſe of antiquity, and for aſſerting, that the only difference between them, is owing to the government they live under—Your concluſions, though not avowed, are, that the people of the preſent day are to be kept in a ſtate of the ſevereſt thraldom—for you aſſert that their vices and follies are more numerous, and that their depravity is irremediable.

Now, I maintain, that theſe ſentiments are falſe and detrimental to the people, whom you have thus traduced. You have already had my creed on this head. I believe that men receive their character, almoſt entirely from the nature of the government they live under—And that liberty exalts, while the want of it haſtens their degeneracy. I believe that the ignorant Barbarian ſlave, who receives his exiſtence on the banks of the Boſphorus, would have been an enlightened republican, had he been born at Philadelphia. I ſhall not affront you by bringing proofs in ſupport of my aſſertions: They are proved by the hiſtory of every nation in the world, and who can be ſuppoſed better acquainted with hiſtory than the author of *la Felicité Publique?*

We may conclude then, that there is no more natural diſtinction between the ancients and moderns, than there is between the whites and the blacks; and that thoſe which do exiſt, are merely accidental—Tranſport the government of Athens to Conſtantinople, and thoſe very Turks who now

‡ Voyage en Amerique, Vol. 2, Page 46. The mine is prepared, the combuſtibles are all ready, nothing but the ſpark is wanting.

appear ſo like barbarians, would equal the Athenians in valour, patriotiſm and knowledge. Liberty would animate theſe machines.

Ceaſe then to vilify the people of the preſent day; drive them not to a ſtate of deſperation; but rather try to encourage them, by ſhowing them that their ſtate of degradation is owing to a cauſe which may be removed; and that when it is, they will become men.

I muſt confeſs, I do not rightly underſtand your meaning, when you ſay, that the defenders of the People of our days, have been liberal of their praiſes to tyrants; this is ſaying, that Locke, Sidney, Price, Rouſſeau, Helvetius and Raynal, have commended them; for theſe writers too, have unfortunately been of opinion, that the People of modern times will be quite on a footing with the ancients, when they ſhall be placed in the ſame ſituation.

But I can clearly ſee, that your ſyſtem is far more favourable to the real oppreſſors of mankind; for by teaching them to conſider the people of the preſent times as unworthy of liberty, and incapable of enjoying it; that the people, and mankind in general are daily degenerating, and will continue to do ſo, even if the cauſe of their degeneracy were removed—I ſay, by teaching ſuch pretended truths as theſe, you encourage their oppreſſors to continue their ſervitude.

But your ſyſtem is utterly falſe; the revolution of America has clearly proved it to be ſo: for the chief actors of this revolution, are the deſcendants of Engliſhmen, (who were oppreſſed by the Stuarts,) or of German ſlaves.

You think to exalt the Americans by putting them on a level with the Greeks and Romans: for my part, I think them vaſtly ſuperior to thoſe ancient nations; But I do not mean to prove my aſſertion at preſent—I ſhall now content myſelf with juſt mentioning my ſentiments on this head; and on a future occaſion demonſtrate, that the men of the preſent age, ſo far from having degenerated, will be ſuperior to their predeceſſors, when placed in a more favourable ſituation.

After having decried the people of the preſent age, you go on to vilify mankind, and the dignity of man, which you look upon as merely comparative, and of courſe, you reckon up the different degrees of the dignity of man. According to your ideas on this ſubject, we have one or two hundred kinds of dignity in Europe, ſuch as the dignity of a Duke, of a Baron, of a Marquis, of a Bailly, &c. &c. What abuſe of words! and what an abominable ſyſtem is here concealed—How can you, who are a philoſopher, believe in the *natural dignity* of a nobleman above a plebeian, of a freeman above a ſlave, or of a white-man above a black? How could it eſcape you, that theſe different degrees of dignities, were but ſo many degrees of injuſtice and uſurpation? How could you maintain the firſt, after having read in the different conſtitutions of America, *that all men are born free, equal, and independent*†; and after having offered to ſhed your blood in defence of ſuch principles? You will ſcarcely maintain that they are not univerſally true; for ſurely no magic can make any principle true, on the banks of the Delaware, and falſe on the Seine —I know that theſe prejudices about diſtinctions ſtill ſubſiſt in Europe; but how very unbecoming is it for a philoſopher to be led away by prejudices, and to go ſo far, as to add new force to them by his writings.

And how could you make mention of the names of Plebeian and Patrician—thoſe fatal diſtinctions, which brought on all the misfortunes and commotions of the Roman republic; diſtinctions, which involved Rome in perpetual wars, that were favourable to ariſtocratic power; which inſpired her with the luſt of conqueſt, and hurried her on to a deſpotic government? if Rome had been acquainted with, and had adopted that natural and ſacred equality which the Americans have made one of the pillars of their

† Rumbold had declared on the Scaffold, in 1684, before the time of the American Legiſlators, that unleſs providence had created ſome men, with ſaddles on their backs, and others with boots and ſpurs to ride them, he would never believe in an inequality. Mrs. Macaulay's hiſtory. Vol. 7.

conſtitutions, her exiſtence would certainly have been of a much longer duration. It was with a view to theſe principles, that I juſt now ſaid, the Americans were ſuperior to the Romans.

The dignity of the freeman, compared with that of the ſlave, has at firſt ſight, ſomething more plauſible in it; and yet it is a mere chimera: For by nature they both poſſeſs an equal degree of dignity; their natural rights are the ſame—Slavery may deprive a man of the uſe of his rights and dignity, but it cannot deprive him of his title to them. The freeman ſhould eſteem himſelf happy in being ſo, but he ſhould at the ſame time, ſympathize with his fellow-creatures who are in ſlavery, and not entertain any ideas of ſelf-ſuperiority. The mean ſlave who glories in his ſituation, is the only proper object of contempt.

But what can you mean by that ſtrange kind of dignity which you have invented to raiſe the whites above the blacks? What title is there to be found for this dignity and ſuperiority? What author has mentioned it? Have not the blacks on the coaſt of Guinea, who are robbed of their gold duſt, their gums, and their children, by European pilferers, as good a reaſon for arrogating to themſelves a dignity and a ſuperiority over the whites?

Away, ſir, with theſe contracted ideas of dignity and inequality; they are far more likely than that general or ſpecific dignity which you find fault with, to inſpire men with ſentiments of tyranny and cruelty towards their fellow-creatures. They anſwer no other end, but that of perpetuating continental, national, civil and perſonal animoſities; and of rendering the earth the ſcene of eternal diſcord and blood-ſhed. For the antiquity of this inequality, can be of no force in depriving us of our rights or of our ſentiments. It prevents no one from being ſenſible, that he is, by birth, equal to the man who enjoys the moſt elevated ſtation; it prevents no one from deteſting, according to his feelings, the man who violates this equality, by ruining or debaſing his fellow-creatures.

This is no new doctrine—Rouſſeau had taught it, and Locke and Sidney had taught it before him: It was their opinion alſo, that the wars and crimes of mankind were owing to this inequality, this comparative dignity which you are ſo liberal in your praiſes of, which you cheriſh and deify, under the appellation of order and ſymetry—you, the noble champion for equality amongſt the Americans! And yet, you who have drawn your ſword in ſupport of the dignity of men, are ignorant of the meaning of the term! read over, once more, the firſt ſection of the conſtitution of Pennſylvania; you will there find a clear and ſublime definition of this term, which now appears to you ſo obſcure and indeterminate; and which you blame the philoſophers for having made an improper uſe of.

The dignity of man conſiſts in his liberty, in his equality of rights, in his independence, in the power he poſſeſſes, of being ſubject to no laws, but thoſe which are made by his own conſent; in the *controul* whith he exerciſes over thoſe to whom he has delegated authority. The dignity of man conſiſts, moreover, in the perfect developement of his moral and intellectual faculties, in his efforts to diſcover, and promulgate truth—It conſiſts, in a word, in *great ideas*, in a *ſteady and determined reſolution*. The mere man of the world, who is from his very infancy ſurrounded by narrow prejudices, and appearances, which he is continually obliged to give up to, who is always converſant with men of confined ſentiments, and void of reſolution; the mere man of the world, I ſay, poſſeſſes not this dignity; I do not mean to affirm that this principle has not been implanted in his breaſt, or that it cannot expand itſelf when a favourable opportunity offers; but when ſuppreſſed, it languiſhes and withers—It is reviviſied by meditation, by the electrifying power of vigorous minds, by holding converſe with the mighty dead, by continually ſtudying thoſe hiſtories, which afford the noble ſpectacle of an individual oppoſing a tyrant. All theſe

ſupports afforded to man, fill his mind with exalted ſentiments, impel him to the purſuit of noble objects, and determine him boldly to reſolve on performing every thing that is good and ſublime. Having thus explained to you the theory of what I mean by the dignity of man, I ſhall ſhew you, by a few examples, where it has been realized.—A Hampden, ſuffering impriſonment, rather than pay an illegal tax; A Sidney, aſcending the ſcaffold * with compoſure; A Locke, unfolding his ideas on civil government; A Rouſſeau, writing his ſocial contract; A Franklin, undergoing his examination with wiſdom and firmneſs, before the Britiſh Parliament; A Warren, breathing his laſt in the cauſe of liberty, at Bunker's Hill; A Burke, proſecuting the deſtroyer of the Rohillas and the Tyrant of the Indies—Theſe are great examples, and illuſtrious monuments, of the dignity of man; if you cannot perceive it in ſuch examples, I pity you—There are thoſe who will readily diſcover it, men, who have not loſt the ſenſe of their primitive greatneſs, and of their rights. The Engliſh nation, but more certainly the Americans, will eaſily diſcover it; numbers of them undoubtedly will ſigh on reading this inconſiderate attack of yours againſt the dignity of man: They will naturally enquire, why you went to America, ſince you do not believe in the dignity of man; ſince you are only for comparative dignities, which they are either unacquainted with, or hold in contempt; and finally, ſince you are for an inequality of rank, which they have excluded, from a belief of their being the ſource of all political evils.

This is not the only paſſage, wherein you diſcover your contempt for the People; it is manifeſt elſewhere. For inſtance, you deſcribe the People of Pennſylvania, as being more inclined to anarchy, than democracy. I ſhall not now attempt to diſcuſs the motives which dictated this reflection upon the inha-

* I have frequently quoted this celebrated writer; to form a juſt idea of his merits, it will be neceſſary to ſtudy his works with care, and to read Mrs. Macaulay's account of his death.

bitants of Pennſylvania, who appear to me, to have in part realized the idea of as perfect a democracy, as it is poſſible to conceive, although perhaps it is too refined for the preſent ſtate of things. This is certain, that the word anarchy, has been heretofore greatly abuſed. But I reſerve my ſentiments on this abuſe of words, for another work.

I have finiſhed the unpleaſing taſk I impoſed upon myſelf, in the beginning of this letter. I think I have proved, that you have calumniated the Quakers, the Negroes, the People and Mankind.

I ought perhaps to extend my obſervations to the other numerous errors contained in your travels ; they muſt be dangerous under the ſanction of your name. None of them are unintereſting : but I was not made for a critic, it is too painful an occupation for me. I ſhall therefore confine myſelf to a few remarks upon ſome of your ſentiments, and ſuch anecdotes as appeared moſt ſtriking.

To begin with your opinion on the art of war. You have principally applied yourſelf to a deſcription of the different engagements which have effected the American revolution. You think theſe deſcriptions uſeful for military men, that they will be particularly ſo to thoſe of America ; and by the complaiſance with which you treat the ſubject, we perceive that it is your favourite art, and that you believe it very neceſſary to ſociety, eſpecially in a republic.

I am entirely of a different opinion, and independent of the uncertainty, and inutility of ſuch deſcriptions, * I ſeriouſly believe that the military art tends to the advancement of ariſtocracy, and conſequently ought to be baniſhed from republics. I will not enter into thoſe declamations, with which philoſophers are reproached, when they write upon it, and ſhall advance nothing but well atteſted facts.

* Marſhal Villars held ſuch plans and deſcriptions very cheap. To form a perfect judgment, he would ſay, we muſt ſee with our own eyes. On being adviſed at court, to overflow the country, to ſecure the fort of Kell, he expreſſed himſelf as follows : *It looks very well upon paper, where we may lay what we pleaſe under water with a ſtroke of the bruſh.* Vie du Maréſchal de Villars, Vol. 1.

The moment you make war a profeſſion, you conſtitute a body of men who are conſtantly engaged in it, ſtudy it, teach it, and conſequently forſake commerce and agriculture; they muſt therefore be maintained by their fellow citizens.

Thoſe who poſſeſs this art, will employ it to acquire fame or wealth, they conſequently deſire, and foment hoſtilities: but republics ought to ſhun war, and eſpecially the ſpirit of it.

If this art is not employed abroad, it will be at home.

As the military form a diſtinct body, they think themſelves ſuperior to their fellow-citizens, eſpecially thoſe who are peaceable. Prejudices encreaſe; it renders ſome inſolent, and debaſes others.

The military art diminiſhes true courage. It is to nations what fencing is to individuals. It ſupplies the place of true courage, but does not inſpire it. Now republics muſt defend themſelves from foreign attacks with courage.

When men ſhall be thoroughly inſpired with the love of liberty, and accuſtomed to exerciſe it in its full extent, they will poſſeſs a ſpirit no military art can ſubdue. The man who exclaims *I will die or be free*, has no maſter; the nation that repeats it, is no longer enſlaved. A conqueror might maſſacre them all, but he could not make himſelf maſter of a ſingle individual. Such courage does not need the ſupport of art or fortifications*. It can ſupport itſelf.

The real ſtrength of a republic, depends upon the inſuperable attachment of its members to liberty and their rights. Poſſeſſing this, the republican repels every attack, he ſoon learns this military art, he harraſſes and overcomes all his enemies: Witneſs many of the American generals, whoſe virtues and abilities you acknowledge. The greateſt part of them had never handled a muſquet; they had been merchants, far-

* See an excellent letter of Mr. de la Clos, upon the boaſted utility of fortifications, addreſſed to the academy, on occaſion of the eulogium of Vauban.

mers, phyſicians, book-ſellers. Witneſs Warren, Knox, Morgan, Greene, and the infamous Arnold, whoſe talents ſhould have ornamented the ſoul of a patriot. And no wonder that republicans ſo ſpeedily acquire military ſkill. The preſervation of their liberties engages every faculty ; a more powerful incentive than the pay of mercenaries, or even the diſtinctions of European armies. This is the reaſon that one or two years experience, and two or three defeats, inſtruct republicans more than twenty or thirty years ſpent in the ſervice of other governments†.

Animated by the love of liberty, republican ſoldiers are more patient, and bear fatigue better than hired troops. Witneſs your own commendations of the American ſoldiers, who always fought bravely, although ill paid, ill provided for, ill cloathed, and unaccuſtomed to the buſineſs. You allow that they ſoon learned to ſerve the artillery, that their barracks were of the beſt conſtruction, that they were brave, &c. &c. &c. What produced theſe wonders ? The love of liberty. While they preſerve it, they will have nothing to fear, and the military art will be uſeleſs to them.

They will do well to remember the battles you deſcribe, not to ſtudy the plans or circumſtances of them, but as ſplendid monuments erected to liberty. If they are ever obliged to reaſſume their arms, the ſame genius will inſpire them without this ſtudy.

In a word, every individual of a republic, ſhould be brave, ſhould be a ſoldier, by birth the defender of his country ; but none ſhould be ſo by profeſſion.

Republics have no more need of ſtanding armies, than of magiſtrates, or repreſentatives for life ; which introduce war and corruption, with deſpotiſm in their train.

† While we praiſe the Americans for their gallant defence of liberty ; we muſt not forget to pay the ſame tribute to the patriotic ardour of our own countrymen.

You, Sir, no doubt think differently, you love war, and boaſt that it is the paſſion of our countrymen: *We love war*, you cry with an air of triumph; ſo much the worſe; I ſee no reaſon to boaſt of diſeaſe: The real proſperity of France will depend upon the abatement of this paſſion for war.

You alſo compliment us on another account, leſs fatal perhaps, but of dangerous influence upon our manners and conſtitutions; I mean the taſte for ridicule, for which you are a warm advocate, and laviſh it upon every thing: You think good epigrams are made no where but in France, and a Frenchman never ſuffers himſelf to be outdone in this point, ſo much the worſe; Aſia has produced the beſt fabuliſts.

All our great wits have repeated from Horace, that ridicule is an excellent weapon. Ridiculum acre magnas plerumque ſecat res. But Horace wrote under Auguſtus—Let me give you my reaſons for hating and proſcribing ridicule:

Ridicule accuſtoms us to laugh at abuſes which ought to excite indignation; it produces nothing but a volatile ſenſation, which paſſes off without any durable exertions to remove the evil: The epigram is ſoon forgotten, but the complaint remains.

It is otherwiſe with a grave people, accuſtomed to reflection in forming a judgment of things: When a writer has demonſtrated to ſuch a people, the exiſtence and effects of a public evil; convinced and alarmed, they intereſt themſelves in it, and the government perceives and corrects its error†.

To reform a people therefore, they muſt be reclaimed from the rage for ridicule, and brought back to cool reaſoning. Ridicule is a rattle to amuſe children.

† To perceive the difference between the effects of ridicule and rational enthuſiaſm, we need only compare the times of la Ligue and la Fronde, in our own country, with the revolutions of 1650 and 1688, in England. Our ſatires were excellent. La Menipée appeared, and Blot and Marigny entertained all France, at the expence of Mazarine: but Mazarine maintained his ground. The Engliſh leſs facetious, obtained the famous *Bill of Rights* which ſecured perſonal liberty, the freedom of the preſs, the right of repreſentation, &c.

What is a nation in a ſtate of infancy? Nothing: For ſhame, let us no longer compliment ourſelves upon our ſongs and our ballads.

You ſeem to regret that the taſte for theſe things abates, that we are no longer ſo jocoſe, ſo epigramatic. This is to regret that the empire of reaſon has commenced.

You regret that our converſation begins to grow dull from being too rational; for you think we are the only people who know how to converſe. Why this inſult to all nations and to truth? Can it be ſaid that we know how to converſe in France, where it is cuſtomary to liſten to nothing, and men of parts eſpecially, thinking themſelves above inſtruction, indulge their own ideas, without attending to yours? What is converſation? It ought to be a means of connecting mankind, of informing the judgment and humanizing the heart. But are theſe the objects of a French converſation? Do we inſtruct, nay do we even amuſe one another? We merely glance upon our ſubjects. From the weather to a criticiſm upon the opera, from the opera to a battle, from the battle to a cap, &c. If you regret that this ſublime ſtyle of amuſing and inſtructive converſation declines, you muſt pardon me for not joining you. But do not think me leſs a friend to my countrymen than yourſelf, who appear to flatter them. I believe that they poſſeſs the ſeeds of every virtue, and that their expanſion depends upon themſelves; while you give them nothing but the art of punning:* which of us honors them moſt? In like manner intending to compliment our French women you traduce them in the following deſcription; ‡ 'not a motion without grace, no grace without 'expreſſion—The wiſh to pleaſe perfects and perpetu-'ates the means of pleaſing, and nature is rather aſ-'ſiſted than thwarted by art, *not being abandoned to the*

* It is aparently to prove yourſelf a good Frenchman, that you have dealt out puns and witicifms with ſuch a liberal hand; informing us for inſtance that our Phyſicians are no Grecians; that Simitiere (which for the ſake of a pun, you miſpell Cimetiere) is rather the name of a Doctor than a Painter; and deſcribe a converſation with the popular chief, Adams, in the contemptuous light of private aſſignation. &c.

‡ Vol. 2, Page 97.

' cares of domeſtic life, nor waſted by continual childbear-
' ing.' That is to ſay plainly, that you compliment our countrywomen, upon being no longer good mothers or good houſewives, and not ſcrupling to deſtroy their poſterity for the ſake of preſerving an elegant ſhape, and pleaſing their unmarried gallants. Shocking thought! what muſt the Americans think of our morals and of our women, at leaſt in Paris (for this is only a view of the capital) when they read your travels, ſhould any of them be weak enough to be ſeduced by this licentious language, or tempted to ſacrifice to the ſame deſires? Heaven preſerve thoſe republicans from ſuch depravity!

Perhaps, and it is to be hoped, that the ſatires upon the Americans, and their chaſte partners, with which your book abounds, will operate as an antidote to the pleaſing venom it contains. Satires, you will ſay. Yes, caſt your eye over the following liſt, which comprehends but a very ſmall part of them.

You repreſent the American women, as being little accuſtomed to give themſelves any trouble, and indifferent about every thing, except ſipping their tea, and keeping the houſe clean. Let the reader compare this picture, with that of their virtues, drawn by St. John de Crevecœur, who has lived ſo long in America, and he may judge how much you wrong them.

Your informing them in another place, that you did not think any of them handſome, or that they danced ill, is a piece of rudeneſs that French urbanity ſhould have forbidden.

But your ſatiric vein flows moſt freely, when you bring an old or homely woman upon the ſtage. With what glaring colours you paint Mrs.——and the lady you openly expoſe by a ſarcaſm, upon her taſte for liberty, not even ſuppreſſing the initials of her name, leaſt the blow ſhould miſs: Could you ſuppoſe that ſuch affected myſtery could conceal her in a city of but twenty thouſand inhabitants, in which the circle of ladies who uſe white and red, muſt be very contracted.

You praiſe none of them, except it is for imitating the levity and frivolouſneſs of our French women, or becauſe ſhe intends to introduce the faſhions at Philadelphia, and produce a revolution in the taſte of the toilette, of greater importance you ſay, than that already effected in politics.

You treat the men with as little ceremony: you charge them openly with formality, pedantry, ingratitude, hypocriſy, and even roguery. Their ſlighteſt defects could not eſcape your obſerving eye. Here a ſcholar addreſſes you in French, and you do not anſwer him in Engliſh, not to rob him of *the pleaſure of diſplaying what he knows*. There you ridicule the director of a ball, upon the ſolemn air, with which he exerciſes his office; or a reſpectable governor, to whom you give all the pedantry of a republican, a Barnevelt, or a Heinſius. Heaven grant our petit maitres ſuch pedantry and ſuch virtues, and they will at leaſt reſemble men. In another place, you ſow the ſeeds of diſcord between the different citizens, by repreſenting, that ſome of the Americans call the Dutch *thick-ſkulls*, and make them the butt of their ridicule.

Thus perhaps your book will give riſe to jealouſy and ill-will.

Nor muſt I forget the ridicule you caſt upon ſome of thoſe religious republicans for ſaying *grace*.

Why make a jeſt of religion, before people who reverence it? Recollect, that the ſettlement of America was owing to religious enthuſiaſm, which has given her the character of firmneſs that ſtill exiſts, and to which her preſent liberty is to be aſcribed. Recollect, that the Atheiſts ſided with Charles IId. † and flattered him; while the Puritans did honour to human nature, but their voluntary exile.

What muſt we think of thoſe diſſolute princi-

* I do not mean to infer however that all Atheiſts are partiſans of deſpotiſm.

ciples, which you endeavour to excuſe, by apologizing for yourſelf, in the affair of the American Girl, a tale you ſhould have ſuppreſſed in reſpect to morality, and the peace of the unhappy woman. But the pen drops from my hand, and I can follow you no longer, for it ſeems to me that your epigrammatic conceits have cauſed you to forget the reſpect due to ſtrangers, to allies, to friends, to good people who gave you a friendly welcome, and vied with each other to entertain you.

If your travels contained information, let them be made public: But muſt it be publiſhed to the whole univerſe if you chanced to meet with an inkeeper who had loſt an eye or was hump-backed? Have you forgotten that every thing which may tend to humble an individual unneceſſarily and undeſervedly, ought to be concealed, and this is always the caſe with natural defects? that ſilence is a duty in ſtrangers, whoſe *ridicule* may make a laſting impreſſion? Have you forgotten the reſpect that every writer owes to his readers? Can the faults or vices of private individuals intereſt the public? or the intelligence that ſuch a one loves grog, is very tedious, or a great boaſter? and that ſuch a woman is old or ugly, &c. ? What concluſions can be drawn from ſuch wretched anecdotes? Shall we conclude like the German, who deſcribed all the women of Blois to be red haired and ill-tempered, becauſe his hoſteſs was ſo.

If ſuch circumſtances cannot be generalized they are not worth notice: for every private fact, which will not admit of general inferences relating to hiſtory, manners or cuſtoms, is uſeleſs, and ought to be ſuppreſſed. Before a traveller publiſhes his obſervations, he ought to be fully impreſſed with the thought which Phedrus has expreſſed in the following adage, *niſi utile eſt quod facimus ſtulta eſt gloria:* Thus after riding over a vaſt extent of country,* and ſeeing

* This appears to have been the ſole object of your Travels. You ſay no leſs yourſelf, Vol II. page 1. *True to the reſolution I had formed in my*

a great many men and a great many things. To form an intereſting picture of them, we muſt repreſent what may be uſeful to the public. § On this principle two thirds of your travels might be retrenched, and the remainder would be leſs imperfect. In juſtice to ſuch of my countrymen who have read your travels I muſt ſay, that your book has made the ſame impreſſions upon them that it has upon myſelf, and no doubt the Americans will be pleaſed to hear it: I therefore proteſt in their names againſt thoſe inferences, which might be drawn from it upon our national character. The Americans may believe me when I aſſure them that many of the brave Frenchmen who have defend- their cauſe, have the higheſt eſteem for their conſtitutions, their manners and their cuſtoms; that they are generally eſteemed in France; and that our different habits have not prevented us from perceiving the full value of their ſimplicity and innocence. They may reſt aſſured, that many of our countrymen who may have the ſatisfaction of viſiting them in future, will be very capable of ſtudying their conſtitution, and improving by their manners, without betraying the confidence of hoſpitality.

Perhaps, ſir, you will complain of the ſeverity of my cenſure, and the apparent harſhneſs of this examination. It is ſevere I allow: but ſuch is my diſpoſition that I can neither diſguiſe* my feelings nor expreſs them with indifference.

child-hood to neglect no opportunity of ſeeing as much of the world as I poſſibly could. &c.

§ Travellers are not ſo cautious as they ſhould be, in the publiſhing their obſervations: For one that is juſt, there are often one hundred falſe. Indeed, it is impoſſible to examine a nation at a ſingle glance. Long acquaintance is neceſſary to qualify for a faithful deſcription. To catch a feature in riding poſt, is to run a riſk of drawing a portrait without a trace of the original.

* I do not love diſguiſes even in delicate points—There are ſome authors who have gained the reputa ion of boldneſs, by ſlipping a few political truths into their works, which have eſcaped cenſure, by paſſing unobſerved. But it ſeems to me that theſe direct methods betray their puſillanimity, and are at once a diſgrac to the writer, who ſacrifices truth to fear, the age and the country, which are thought not to be ripe enough to have it, and the adminiſtration, which has not virtue enough to ſuffer it; they tend to inſpire other writers with timidity; and the

I know that ſeverity is reckoned a ſort of crime among us in the preſent age, wherein falſe politeneſs is ſubſtituted in the place of honeſt freedom, that is to ſay a ſhadow for the ſubſtance. I muſt therefore juſtify my bluntneſs. It may poſſibly tend to remove thoſe prejudices which diſcourage the inveſtigation and retard the progreſs of truth in our country.

When one writer has attacked another with warmth, we are apt to exclaim: Why ſo ſevere? He might have been treated with decency at leaſt.

This national diſlike to ſeverity is a proof that vice preponderates and *character is loſt*. Every individual capitulates more or leſs with the duties of his ſtation, and barters his moral obligations for titles or penſions, and every one, conſcious of his own miſconduct, and recognizing ſome features of himſelf in the portrait of the weak or the guilty man, expoſed to public view, inclines to indulgence, becauſe he ſtands in need of it himſelf; and joins to perſecute the nervous writer becauſe he is a ſtranger to the ſpirit by which he is actuated; for innocence itſelf is an offence to the guilty.

I make no doubt that when Cicero uttered his thundering orations againſt Catiline, there were ſome ſenators weak enough to adviſe him to moderation; perhaps in the puſillanimous adage, *we muſt not give offence*. Falſe maxim! Gentleneſs has ever been the ruin of individuals as well as communities. Bad men have made but too much advantage of the indulgence of virtue: For which reaſon I think that a virtuous man ought to be uniformly ſevere, that his character ſhould be ſtrongly marked, and boldly expreſſed, that he ſhould never weaken his ſentiments, or affect a dangerous moderation: truth demands, and the general good requires it.

Writers, above all men, ſhould obſerve this line of conduct, to render themſelves worthy of the taſk of inſtructing mankind; for how can they expect the confidence of their fellow-citizens, if they condeſcend

effect of recent and ſtriking facts is deſtroyed by theſe means. In the preſent age, when Rouſſeau, Price, and Helvetius are in every body's hands, there is no neceſſity for diſguiſing truths which ſhine in every page of their writings.

to accommodate their principles to circumſtances, or compromiſe with the enemies of the community? They cannot, their influence is juſtly forfeited. It is ſaid they only play their parts, and the wicked remain as before.

This decided character, now quite loſt among our writers, was univerſal, during the ſixteenth and ſeventeenth centuries. The civil diſſentions, which then divided the citizens into parties, and impreſſed them with peculiar characters, influenced the writers of thoſe times: Each was attached to a party, and treated its opponents with rigor. And this was not without its uſe: for the apprehenſion of a ſevere cenſure, obliged them to be juſt and accurate. The preſent gentleneſs of cenſure, has been the ruin of ſcience.

In this reſpect I confeſs myſelf much better pleaſed with the manner in which Saumaiſe and Petau, Bayle and Jurieu, treated each other, than with the inoffenſive ſatires and hypocritical compliments. ſo common in our academies, and modern pamphlets.

It may be objected that abuſe proves nothing. I grant it; but it ſerves to unmaſk a character. What is proved by our perfidious compliments, our cutting ironies, and our Italics eſpecially? Mere malice without any of that frankneſs which might palliate its malignity.

Beſides, abuſe is too often applied to that boldneſs of feature, wherein the man of virtue is obliged to paint the villain. What! ſhall Locke or Sidney, refuting the doctrines of the deteſtable Filmer, be required to treat him with delicacy and tenderneſs? No: living or dead, let infamy brand the villain.

Such a character as theſe two great men poſſeſſed, can never be concealed; it will appear in the phyſiognomy, the geſtures, the ſpeech, the writings of its poſſeſſor. Men of cooler tempers, ſtrive to diſcourage it, by ſtarting difficulties in its way, and the friends of the party ſecond their endeavours from prudential conſiderations; but if it is deeply rooted, oppoſition only forces it to expand itſelf, which is a happineſs for the public, as well as for the individual who is ſo ſtrongly organized. He poſſeſſes in himſelf an

ample recompenſe for every inconvenience to which it may ſubject him. Such a one, like the philoſophers of antiquity, ought to conſult his ſecret genius upon every occaſion. It is the nymph of Numa, the demon of Socrates, and the ſpiritual light of the Quakers. He ought to liſten to it, with unceaſing attention, and ſpeak when it inſpires.* Its inſpirations never decieve thoſe whoſe primary object is the public good, nor can they fail of general utility.

With ſuch a character, it is impoſſible to be a cool ſpectator of ſcenes that ſhock every feeling of humanity, or remain unmoved at the ſight of general calamity and injuſtice.

The generality of our writers preſerve their moderation amidſt theſe ſhocking ſcenes: They treat even criminals and oppreſſors, with civility and tenderneſs, becauſe they have neither ſpirit, nor character. ‡ Shall I tell you the reaſon of this? Independent of other general cauſes, it may be attributed to their way of life. Conſider how a great character is formed, and then caſt your eye upon the life of one of our writers.

A nervous character, is the reſult of a natural elevation of ſentiment, an habitual indignation at the ſight

* Great men who are invariably animated by a ſpirit of this kind, have always had cauſe to repent, when they have neglected to pay implicit obedience to its impulſes. Hampden, the friend of Sidney, being accuſed of the ſame crime, at firſt choſe to ſhare his fate; but impelled by the preſſing ſolicitations of his friends, he conſented to caſt himſelf upon the king's mercy, and ſaved his life at the expence of a puniſhment worſe than death itſelf: for he reproached himſelf for his weakneſs, all the reſt of his life, and at laſt put an end to his miſery by ſuicide.

‡ Notwithſtanding, we muſt do juſtice to ſome late writers who have boldly defended the rights of mankind. This generous zeal has penetrated even to the bar, and the preſent year has given riſe to ſpirited memorials, in favour of oppreſſed innocence. Their authors not confining themſelves to the defence of their clients, have extended their obſervations to general liberty, the ſocial compact, the duties of government, the faults of miniſters and the miſconduct of inferiors, who are always more obdurate and oppreſſive, than their maſters. Some of the moſt remarkable of theſe memorials are thoſe of M. Thilorier, that juſt publiſhed by M. Lacretelle, in favour of the unfortunate Comte de Sanvis, and thoſe in particular, written by my reſolute and intrepid friend, M. Bergaſſe, againſt the villains who have ſo long perſecuted M. Kornmann.

of oppreſſion, and frequent meditation, which tends to preſerve the ſoul from the external cauſes of general lethargy and decay; in a word, it is the reſult of a man's conſtant communion with his own heart or with ſuperior objects.

But how rare are theſe habits! can ſuch meditation be enjoyed amidſt the hurry and diſſipation of a metropolis: yet here our geniuſes are ſent to receive that poliſh which is often fatal to every bold and original quality. Here they connect themſelves in ſocieties, communicate indiſcriminately with each other, or with men of weaker minds, and thus debaſe themſelves. Intereſt or habit, accuſtom them to praiſe whatever they meet with in theſe ſocieties, and ſo the public is deceived. Is it worth while to undeceive it? All muſt live---and to live in peace, muſt avoid giving offence. Upon this principle, liberty, character, and independence, are ſoon loſt, and the cauſe of truth is ſerved only as it ſuits convenience.

Perhaps you will ſay that all this has been in print twenty times before—granted; it has been twenty times true, is now ſo for the twenty-firſt time, and is ſtill neceſſary to be repeated, for the evil remains unreformed. It may alſo be affirmed, that truth, virtue and reformation, are only to be expected from the man who devotes himſelf to ſolitude and obſcurity. Elevated ideas, bold reſolutions, in a word, great characters are formed in ſolitude; and what can be expected from ſuch a man, but ſeverity of cenſure, which, notwithſtanding, is by no means incompatible with kindneſs or urbanity. Authors ſhould be friendly when they meet, ſhould cheriſh and aſſiſt each other in caſes of neceſſity, and beſtow their applauſes when merited; but they ſhould alſo openly, candidly and vigorouſly, oppoſe each other, when wrong. Thus Price and Prieſtly, Kirwan and Cavendiſh, now treat each other in England. They are friends as far as is conſiſtent with truth. Thus the patriot Jebb, treated the celebrated Charles Fox. Although intimately connected with him in private life, he warmly oppoſed him in his writings, and in all public aſſemblies.

Theſe are the examples I propoſed to myſelf for imitation. Whenever opportunity offered, I have paid a juſt tribute of eſteem to your uſeful treatiſe de la Felicité Publique; I cannot therefore be ſuſpected of prejudice in this reply to your ſatires upon the Quakers, the Negroes, and the dignity of man. They excited concern and indignation in my breaſt: I have expreſſed what I felt; if the warmth of my feelings has ſometimes hurried me too far, aſcribe it to the importance of the object; but do not ſuſpect me of a wiſh to offend you: it always was and always will be far from my intention.

Notwithſtanding, I have freely cenſured ſuch parts of your travels as appeared to me to deſerve blame, or lead to deſtructive conſequences, I am not the leſs inclined to do juſtice to your intereſting enquiries, and your juſt encomiums upon thoſe celebrated characters who have contributed to reſtore the freedom of America. Is there a ſingle Frenchman, or American, who will not review with ſatisfaction the portraits of Waſhington†, the learned Jefferſon, and that gallant youth whom you ſo juſtly deſcribe as the hope of our nation, *ſpes altera Romæ*, whoſe name will never be ſeparated from that of his friend and father Waſhington, in the annals of the United States. Theſe paſſages and ſome others almoſt equally intereſting which relate to the American generals, together with your anecdotes of the revolution, ſtripped of the idle tales, ſcandalous ſtories, epigrams, puns, and miſtaken notions, would form a volume of valuable materials for the hiſtory of the United States. No doubt the friends of liberty and humanity will join me in encouraging you to preſent them with ſuch a work: *Ex fumo dare lucem*—this is now incumbent upon you, and would be uſeful to the public, as well as honorable to yourſelf.

PARIS, *July 1ſt*, 1786.

† Yet I am ſorry to remark, even in this paſſage, ſomething ſo ſtudied and formal, that it muſt damp the enthuſiaſm which it ought to inſpire.

POSTCRIPT.

I HAD juſt finiſhed this letter, when a friend handed me the review of your travels, which appeared in the *Mercure* of the firſt of July.

The following paſſage in which the Quakers are mentioned, ſtruck me particularly : " A converſation with *one* Mr. Benezet leads the author to ſpeak of the Quakers. Some think he has not done them juſtice. We alſo doubt whether his reproaches may be generally deſerved by them. The religious principles of *theſe people* do not inſpire them with bad morals, beſides it appears improbable that theirs ſhould differ from thoſe of their fellow-citizens, &c. &c."

I do not know the writer of this article. Whoever he was, it is aſtoniſhing that he ſhould take the liberty to ſpeak in this contemptuous ſtyle of Mr. Benezet and the Quakers. He could not be ignorant that the article *one* before a proper name is never ſo applied in our language but to men of contemptible characters : he could not be ignorant, that the expreſſion *thoſe people*, is inſulting, and blends a body of valuable men with what we call the vulgar : If he was not ignorant, how dared this journaliſt to make uſe of ſuch expreſſions, to deſcribe an individual and a ſociety who are equally reſpectable ? Where is the man in all Europe, of whatever rank or birth, who is equal to Benezet ? who is not obliged to reſpect him ? How long will authors ſuffer themſelves to be ſhackled by the prejudices of ſociety ? Will they never perceive that nature has created all men equal— that wiſdom and virtue are the only real criterion of ſuperiority ? Now who was more virtuous than Benezet ? who more uſeful to ſociety, to mankind ? What author, what great man, will ever be followed to his grave by four hundred Negroes, ſnatched, by his own aſſiduity, his own generoſity, from ignorance, wretchedneſs, and ſlavery ? Who, then, has a right to ſpeak haughtily of this benefactor of men ?

With reſpect to the Quakers, after having conſidered the abſtract here given, of their religious, moral

and political principles, it muſt excite indignation, to hear them deſcribed under the contemptuous appellation of *thoſe people*. Shall nothing be honored but titles, rank, or ſplendor? and will authors always conſpire with the favourers of ariſtocracy, to place the modeſt and ſimple virtues below titles, to which they are infinitely ſuperior? On looking over what you ſay againſt the Quakers, I ſee with concern that you have not only uſed a like expreſſion of contempt yourſelf when ſpeaking of Benezet, but that you have even affected to *thee* and *thou* him in converſation. Permit me to make a remark upon this ſubject, which eſcaped me before: It is a principle of the Quakers, to reject thoſe ceremonious expreſſions, which have been invented by vanity or meanneſs. They cannot ſee any *natural* difference in their fellow-creatures, ſufficient to authorize a diſtinction in their addreſs or deportment toward each other. The practice of ſaying *you* to a ſingle perſon, appears to them falſe and abſurd. Whether they are right or wrong, in this reſpect, it is equally certain, that plain language cannot be rude in them. They uſe it among themſelves, whatever relation they bear to each other: they uſe it to every body. But it does not follow, that thoſe who are not of their ſect, who have not their principles, or way of thinking, ſhould ſpeak in the ſame ſtyle to them. It would not only be very impolite to do ſo, but a miſplaced familiarity: yet plain language is not a mark of familiarity in the Quakers. Without departing from their *thee* and *thou*, they are careful to acknowledge the reſpect due to merit, to age, and to authority; and are decently reſerved in their addreſs to ſtrangers. They know what good breeding requires, and are pleaſed with reſpectful treatment as well as the reſt of the world: for they are at no loſs to account for the affected plainneſs of thoſe whoſe manners and principles are not conſiſtent with ſuch behaviour. It muſt appear to them either a miſplaced familiarity or the miſtake of ignorance, which being unable to comprehend the motive of their cuſtoms, thinks to

flatter them by a conformity to one of the leaſt importance. Or indeed (as is moſt commonly the caſe) from that contracted ſelf-love which is mortified by ſuch bluntneſs, although it is univerſal and without reſpect of perſons. In a word, they are ſenſible that plainneſs of ſpeech is not contemptuous in them, but that it is ſo in other people, unleſs dictated by friendſhip or conſanguinity. There is another abſurdity, ſir, in this review: its author doubts the juſtice of your charges againſt the Quakers, becauſe, ſays he, *their religious principles do not inſpire them with bad morals*. As if any religious principles inſpired bad morals!—as if all the members of a ſect muſt neceſſarily be honeſt men, becauſe its principles are good!—as if there had never been any Proteſtant or Catholic rogues, becauſe Proteſtant or Catholic principles do not inculcate roguery! Contemptible argument! weak defence! only calculated to confirm the public in the idea you give of the Quakers, which it is evident that the fawning or cowardly author of this article did not dare to oppoſe.

Such criticiſm is a diſgrace to the man who undertakes to give the public the true character of a book. He ſhould be perfectly maſter of the ſubject it is written upon. And, to return to the Quakers: if this writer muſt give his opinion between you, he ſhould have been well acquainted with Barclay's Apology, and every other publication in their favour, but eſpecially the letters of M. St. John de Crevecœur; or if he had never read them, he might have confeſſed his ignorance, and kept his judgment to himſelf.

If I were inclined to diſcuſs moſt of the other articles in this review, it would be eaſy to demonſtrate that almoſt all of them are ſtamped with the ſame marks of frivoloufneſs, ignorance, and adulation.

Every thing is praiſed down to the very table of contents, perhaps, becauſe your dinners and ſuppers are faithfully regiſtered there, and not a ſingle fact is criticiſed, not a ſingle idea*.

* I am aſtoniſhed that he ſhould ſuffer your contemptuous expreſſions

We muſt both agree, that people of quality and men of eſtabliſhed reputation have a ſad privilege in France ; it is that of receiving nothing but incenſe. As criticiſm is never wholly free with reſpect to them, this incenſe is never pure ; and the diſgrace of their works, ſo pompouſly announced, ſhews them ſooner or later, that encomiums obtained from meanneſs, by *prudential* conſiderations, will not entitle them to the eſteem of their own age, much leſs to deſcend to poſterity.

I muſt give you one inſtance, ſir, of the puſillanimity of writers of the lower claſs towards privileged authors : it relates to yourſelf.

I was lately in company, when the converſation turning upon your travels, an author related, that not long ſince he could not help conceiting you frowned upon him, at table, and aſked the perſon who ſat next him, what could be the reaſon of it, who anſwered, M. Le Marquis de Chatellux believes you to be the author of the article againſt his travels, in the *Correſpondence Litteraire Secrette :* he has been told that you write for it. For Heaven's ſake undeceive him directly ; I have no hand in it ; I did not write that article. Why need you deny it ſo warmly ? replied I ; the work may deſerve criticiſm. That may be, rejoins my gentleman ; but I would not attack M. de Chaſtellux ;

ſo liberally, and often unjuſtly beſtowed, to paſs entirely unnoticed. For inſtance, I meet with the word ' babbler,' in three different places, and it is miſapplied in them all. A brave hatter is ſtigmatiſed with it, who had forſaken every thing to defend the liberties of his country, and after travelling four hundred miles on foot to join the American forces, had diſtinguiſhed himſelf by a gallant action. He relates it to you very ingenuouſly, and you reward his civility with the opprobrious epithets of babbler and braggart. It is applied in another place to a reſpectable officer, who had taken care of a poor old man that was bitten by a mad dog, and whoſe good qualities might have apologized for the failing if he had been guilty of it, which does not appear to have been the caſe, And laſtly, you apply it to the good woman who ſheltered the unhappy girl, whoſe ſtory ought not to have been expoſed to the world, although this babbler, as you call her, had prudence enough to anſwer your enquiries by replying that it would be too tedious to relate. How many more ſuch remarks might I have made ! But they were neceſſarily ſacrificed to the important truths which I had pledged myſelf to defend.

he has the ear of M. de Monteſquieu, who is in favour with Monſieur the King's brother: it would be the ruin of me; I have a wife and children to provide for. Well, ſir, replied I, I am a father and a huſband as well as you, but I will criticiſe theſe travels, and that openly: for I have too good an opinion of M. le Marquis de Chatellux not to believe, that if I ſhould be perſecuted for it (which but to ſuppoſe, were abſurd and injurious to the perſons you mention) he would himſelf be the firſt to defend me. Indeed it appears to me, that every judicious man, who regards his own intereſt, ſhould be of the opinion of Lycurgus upon public diſcuſſions. This paſſage of Plutarch is ſo ſtriking, and you are ſo great a lover of antiquity, that I am tempted to tranſcribe it entire.

"The Spartan legiſlator, carefully ſtrewed the "ſeeds of ambition and jealouſy among the citizens "of his commonwealth, to whom the adminiſtration "of the public affairs was entruſted, as an incen-"tive to virtue—chooſing that ſuch men ſhould al-"ways have ſomething to canvaſs and controvert, "among themſelves; being convinced that the "ſluggiſh, unmanly courteſy, with which men "mutually concede to, and pardon one another, is "falſely called harmony: and ſome think that Ho-"mer muſt have been of this opinion, or he would "never have made Agamemnon pleaſed to ſee Ulyſ-"ſes and Achilles quarrelling, if he had not thought "that ſtrife and emulation among the principal men, "cauſed them to have a watchful eye upon each "other, and tended to the public advantage." &c. &c.
Plutarch's Life of Ageſilaus.

PARIS, *July* 20, 1786.

E 188
B 859c